LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
MAR 14 1933
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BX 8 .M167
Macfarland, Charles S.
Christian unity in practic
and prophecy

M164c

p87

CHRISTIAN UNITY
IN PRACTICE AND PROPHECY

BOOKS BY CHARLES S. MACFARLAND

THE SPIRIT CHRISTLIKE
THE INFINITE AFFECTION
JESUS AND THE PROPHETS
SPIRITUAL CULTURE AND SOCIAL SERVICE
CHRISTIAN SERVICE AND THE MODERN WORLD
THE GREAT PHYSICIAN
THE PROGRESS OF CHURCH FEDERATION

Books Edited and Written in Collaboration with Others

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY AND THE SOCIAL ORDER
THE CHURCHES OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL
CHRISTIAN UNITY AT WORK
THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN COUNCIL
THE CHURCH AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
THE CHURCH AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS—JAPAN
CHRISTIAN COÖPERATION AND WORLD REDEMPTION
THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN TIME OF WAR
INTERNATIONAL CHRISTIAN MOVEMENTS

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
MAR 14 1933
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

CHRISTIAN UNITY
IN PRACTICE AND PROPHECY

BY

CHARLES S. MACFARLAND

NEW YORK
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1933

COPYRIGHT, 1933,
BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

All rights reserved—no part of this book may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer who wishes to quote brief passages in connection with a review written for inclusion in magazine or newspaper.

Set up and printed. Published February, 1933.

SET UP BY BROWN BROTHERS LINOTYPERS
PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE FERRIS PRINTING COMPANY

To my companions in service for twenty and more years
in the cause of Christian Unity, in the United States
and in Europe,
both the dead and the living,
In grateful recognition of their fellowship and sympathy;
and
To Mary Perley Merrill Macfarland
Who has been my unseen strength and support
at all times
"For she hath been a helper of many,
and of myself also."—*Romans xvi:2.*

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

https://archive.org/details/christianunityin00macf_0

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am deeply and widely indebted, for help in preparing this study, to several of my associates in service; more especially to Alfred Williams Anthony, Secretary of the original Interdenominational Commission of Maine and identified with the organized movement toward federal unity since the Interchurch Council in 1905; to my friend Robert J. Caldwell, good genius to humanity in general and a group of which he is chairman, for their assistance; and to my former secretarial associate, Mrs. Grace Turton Krist, for her patient help in preparing the manuscript.

C. S. M.

FOREWORD

There are many views, voices and volumes on Christian unity. History, while it is being made, often goes, not only unrecorded, but unobserved. Still oftener its currents and movements are misunderstood and it has to await later generations to make it known and, above all, to evaluate its significance. Most of the volumes written on the subject of Christian unity fail to record adequately what has taken place in the last quarter of a century in its actual practice and progress, or make but casual and often erroneous reference to it, without sufficient interpretation of its meaning or what it prophesies, confining themselves to cynical complaints and often to somewhat vague and incoherent appeals for something different. There is an apparent assumption that our present denominations can be dissolved by proclamation if it be sufficiently vocal. These books inspire and incite, but the time approaches for more coherent and pragmatic thinking and action and for the advocates of unity to unite and understand each other.

Indeed one of the difficulties has been that so many of the most articulate proponents of unity have themselves, not only given little help in its practical realization, but are often slightly informed regarding it, in their search for some kind of a full-grown formula which is not clear in their own minds. How often thus it has happened in history that while some prophets have cried out against evils and have exhorted and prayed for some undefined escape, other men, in more humble fashion and in more quiet ways, have been actually approaching the goal by experiential, experimental and patient processes quite different from those ambiguously sought or assumed by the prophets of lamentation. Men have said "Lo here" and "Lo there," while the Kingdom of Heaven of Christian Unity was in their midst. Indeed, if much of our vocal contribution to the issue had been translated into practice we should be farther ahead than we are. Doubtless many of the greatest gains may have been made by men whose names are not known and whose influence has not yet been fully discerned.

Thus we have had two currents, one devoted to the discovery of theories and ultimate forms of unity and the other following a more empirical and pragmatic method. This volume endeavors to give brief historical résumés of these two tides and to indicate their present status, their relation to each other and their future courses.

The writer naturally has in mind promised events of significance. Preparations are being made for the second conference of the Universal Christian Council on Life and Work in 1935 or later and for the second World Conference on Faith and Order at Lausanne, hoped for in 1937. Doubtless the International Missionary Council will also soon be preparing for its next world conference. Meanwhile the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America has had a Committee on Function and Structure, composed of representatives of its constituent bodies, considering the enlargement of the scope of federal unity. It is interesting to note further that a recent message of the Pope indicates an interest far deeper than that which the See of Rome has previously shown in the movements of the Protestant and Eastern Churches for unity. Various groups of denominations in the United States, some of them of the same families, and others obviously homogeneous, have committees of conference on the organic or federal union of these several groups. Looking abroad, the Anglican Communion is seeking closer relationships with the Eastern Churches and the Old Catholic Church, and meanwhile conferences have been held between the Anglican and the Non-

Conformist Churches in Great Britain. Similar movements are taking place in other parts of the world, while in Great Britain the several Methodist bodies have recently united.

Serious attention needs to be given to the recommendations of the recent Laymen's Commission relative to unity in Foreign Missions, as a necessary means towards other important objectives. An attempt is also being made by the Institute of Social and Religious Research to learn the mind of cross-sections of the Christian people themselves.

It seems evident that we are entering upon a new era in our search for unity and that this is a moment for fresh, organizationally detached and sympathetically coöperative thinking, in the light of the last quarter of a century of experience. While this volume is thus mainly historical regarding this period, it will also attempt to be somewhat prophetic and constructive so far as the present moment seems to shed light upon the days to come. It will attempt to tell the story of progress, indicate present trends and tendencies, and venture a prophecy for at least the immediate future.

The assumption in some quarters has been that, following four centuries of disintegration, the churches could become one organic whole similar to the Roman Catholic Church, with accepted visible symbols. The thesis of this volume is that we must rather find our way by experience and follow the step-by-step law of evolution. Therefore it will not attempt to set up a prescribed or final program. The writer is far from persuaded that Roman Catholic unity is a desirable norm, even were allegiance to the Vatican eliminated. That the non-Roman churches are ready today for a unity consistent with diversity and liberty he is profoundly convinced, but this unity must always be that of spirit and life rather than of form. In any event formulas that may be reached must be the result and not the cause or source of unity.

The author, after more than twenty years of somewhat intimate association, especially with the movement for federal unity, will endeavor to detach himself from organizational interests and be as objective as may be humanly possible, while at the same time his conclusions, so far as he ventures upon any, will necessarily be the result of personal experience and observation.[1] He writes solely in his personal capacity and it will be obvious that he does so with less hesitation and more freely than under conditions involving organizational commitment. This work is written for students rather than scholars and for the more popular constituency of the churches, both pastors and laymen. It is hoped that it may also help to guide theological students, with the feeling that fresh thinking needs to be done by younger minds as we enter upon this new era and as we approach the conferences which are fraught, or ought to be fraught, with new significance.

> "Now concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, I would not have you ignorant.
>
> "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit.
>
> "And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord.
>
> "And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all.
>
> "For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit;
>
> "To another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit;
>
> "To another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues;
>
> "But all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit dividing to every man severally as he will.
>
> "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ.
>
> "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether

---

[1] Frequent references have been made to the author's previously published works, in the interest of brevity for this volume.

we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.

"For the body is not one member, but many.

"If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body?

"And if the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body?

"If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where were the smelling?

"But now hath God set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased him.

"And if they were all one member, where were the body?

"But now are they many members, yet but one body.

"And the eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee; nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you.

"Nay, much more those members of the body, which seem to be more feeble, are necessary.

"That there should be no schism in the body; but that the members should have the same care one for another.

"And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it.

"Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular.

"And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues.

"Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers? are all workers of miracles?

"Have all the gifts of healing? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret?

"But covet earnestly the best gifts: and yet shew I unto you a more excellent way."

* * *

"Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal.

"And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing.

"And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing.

"For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known.

"And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity."

* * *

"For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you. That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread:

"And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me.

"After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.

"For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come."

* * *

"Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word;

"That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.

"And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one;

"I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me."

CONTENTS

PAGE

FOREWORD ix

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION: THE PROBLEM 1

The Present Situation. The Purpose of this Study.

II. AN HISTORICAL REVIEW 12

The Teaching of Jesus. The Early Apostolic Church. The Ecumenical Councils. The Reformation Period. The Post-Reformation Period. Lessons to be Learned.

III. THE INFLUENCES AND IMPULSIONS FOR AND AGAINST UNITY AND ITS GENESIS IN THE UNITED STATES 30

The Early Voluntary Movements toward Unity. The Evangelical Alliance. Other Voluntary Movements. A Gradual Growth.

IV. THE PROGRESS OF UNITY IN THE UNITED STATES 49

Early Foreign Missions. Early Approaches to Church Federation. The Genesis of the Federal Council. The Home Missions Council. Twenty-five Years of Federal Unity: The War Period, Post War Problems, Policies of the Federal Council, The Problem of Church and State, Fed-

CHAPTER PAGE

eral Unity: State and Local, The Community Church Movement.

V. THE PROGRESS OF UNITY IN THE UNITED STATES 87

Organic Union of Homogeneous Bodies. The Genius, Spirit and Growth of Federal Unity. The Progress of Federal Unity. Associated Bodies in Federal Unity.

VI. WORLD MOVEMENTS FOR FEDERAL UNITY 105

Influences of the War. World Unity in Foreign Missions. The Universal Christian Council on Life and Work. Federal Unity in Europe.

VII. THE PRESENT AREAS OF SERVICE IN FEDERAL UNITY 126

Foreign Missions. Home Missions and Comity. Evangelism and Life Service. Worship and Devotional Life. Christian Education. Social Service: Industry. Race Relations. International Justice and Goodwill. Other Areas of Service. Relations Abroad. Local Areas.

VIII. THE MOVEMENT FOR ORGANIC UNION 148

The World Conference on Faith and Order. Lessons from the Lausanne Conference. Some Conclusions.

IX. PRESENT PRACTICAL PROBLEMS AND DIFFICULTIES 169

X. PRESENT DENOMINATIONAL ATTITUDES 178

Protestant Bodies. The Protestant Bodies and Federal Unity. The Protestant Episcopal Church. The Anglican Communion. The Eastern Orthodox Churches. The Roman Catholic Church.

CHAPTER PAGE

XI. THE PATH OF ADVANCE 217

In the United States. The Future of Unity in Foreign Missions. The World Movements.

XII. THE FUNCTIONS OF FEDERAL UNITY 259

The Christian Message. The Christian Messengers. Education and Evangelization. Worship and Sacraments or "Faith and Order." Service to Humanity. The Social Ideals of the Churches. Faithful Stewardship. Some Conclusions.

APPENDICES 328

I. MESSAGE OF THE INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL, JERUSALEM, 1928 329

II. CONSTITUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL 342

III. MESSAGE OF THE UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE ON LIFE AND WORK, STOCKHOLM, 1925 349

IV. MESSAGE OF THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER, LAUSANNE, 1927 355

V. STATEMENT OF THE UNITED LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA, 1920 359

VI. REPORT OF THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE, 1930 370

Excerpts on Christian Unity.

VII. STATEMENT OF THE EASTERN ORTHODOX DELEGATES AT LAUSANNE, 1927 380

BIBLIOGRAPHY 385

INDEX 389

CHRISTIAN UNITY
IN PRACTICE AND PROPHECY

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: THE PROBLEM

The need and search for unity are obviously not confined to religious institutions. We have the same essential problem, in its nature, in our social and political life. It is that of developing unity while allowing for the diversity inherent in evolution and, above all, retaining and enlarging, rather than confining or repressing liberty.

The opening quarter of the present century has witnessed the development of processes in our social order which began in the preceding century. Time and space have rapidly lost their significance. Contact and association between social classes, races and nations have become inevitable in a day when the voice from the Vatican or that of Mahatma Gandhi can instantly and constantly make itself heard over the air throughout the world. Every institution of mankind has been reacting to these transpositions in time and space, and civilization among all peoples is now in inverse ratio to their isolation. In the words of Carlyle, "The insight of genius is cooperation with the real tendency of the world," and this is true, whether it be to comply with or to redirect the current.

The Protestant Reformation was a similar readjustment to a new order of human life of that day and generation. The need in that hour was liberty, with its essential concomitant, diversity. Evolution is cyclical, in forward sweeps and backward currents. The theory of thesis and antithesis has always been illustrated in human progress and we are now in the midst of a new re-formation.

Our several denominations arose largely from the demand for freedom, and achieved it, often through much suffering. We are now recognizing, however, that in all our social relations the highest freedom we possess may be the freedom to give up some of our freedom for the common good of all. This was the kind of liberty to which Paul referred in his discussion of those party differences which had already begun in the apostolic church. We are ready to acknowledge—without forgetting perhaps our intellectual or emotional expression of truth in which we have been of Apollos or Cephas—that we are all of Christ, and that in allegiance to Him we must maintain or regain unity even in the midst of our diversity. We are following still farther our search for freedom, and are seeking this highest freedom in our modern movements towards Christian unity. We have discovered the severe truth of the word of Jesus: "He that saveth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life for my sake and the Gospel's shall find it."

Meanwhile the development of a new and complex social order about us required the call of a persuasive and effective gospel. New foes were arising on every hand. They were all united, and we found ourselves facing federated vice, the federated saloon, federated corruption in political life, federated human exploitation, everywhere the alliances of commercialized iniquity. All of these were bound together in a solemn league and covenant, and the reason they so confidently faced a derided church was because they faced a divided one. On the one hand were the federations of labor and, on the other hand, aggregations of capital, girding themselves for bitter conflict, waiting the voice which should speak with power and influence, that should quell their human hatreds, by an insistence upon human justice and love. Sufferers of social wrong were looking to us with entreaty, and we found ourselves obliged to face them, or, worse still, to shun them, with shame upon our faces and with a bewildered consciousness, because we had no articulation of a common code of spiritual principles or moral laws. Our spiritual authority was not equal to our human sympathy, because it was divided.

It should be frankly admitted, however, that the rise of denominations has not always been unjustifiable or deplorable. It was often necessary at the time. Still further, we need to recognize important values in each denomination; they all have special and valuable contributions to make in the varying emphases upon which they differ. The Lutheran bodies today are bearing witness to certain aspects of the Gospel to which some other bodies do not give sufficient attention. We need some of the Methodist spirit of revival. The Baptists and Congregationalists will see to it that we do not forget the grace of liberty. Extremes such as the Anglicans and Quakers have their contributions to make. As a matter of fact, practically all of the larger bodies by no means confine their experience to their own history, and they partake each of the consciousness of the other. In so far as they are desirous of making their special contribution to the whole fellowship they are certainly an advantage to unity. They sing one another's hymns and offer each other's prayers. God has brought into our human order the mingling together of unity and diversity. While it is a unity which is not uniformity, it must also be diversity which is not divisiveness.

THE PRESENT SITUATION

It must be admitted, however, that the difficulty is revealed in our very progress in unification. In entering upon our study we discover what appears at first sight to be a startling aggregation of modern movements for Christian unity, more especially in the United States. There are several bodies looking toward organic union, a much larger number of official or recognized federated institutions, not to mention perhaps something like half a hundred undenominational or voluntary bodies more or less claiming or assuming to represent the churches. In fact, we disclose about as many of these organizational forms as there are substantial denominational bodies, and if our study proceeds more widely it reveals about two score of international and world bodies of one form or another of Christian unity.

The present status of Christian unity and its complications may best be indicated by naming the more important of these bodies and movements:

I. Under the general idea of federation and coöperation we have:

(1) Representing officially, churches of the United States, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

(2) The Universal Christian Council on Life and Work, a world organization.

(3) Representing the boards and departments of the churches in federated counsel and administration:

  (a) The Foreign Missions Conference of North America, the Committee on Cooperation in Latin America and the Federation of Women's Boards of Foreign Missions in the United States and Canada, which form integral parts of the International Missionary Council.

  (b) The Home Missions Council and the Council of Women for Home Missions.

  (c) The International Council of Religious Education, the Council of Church Boards of Education and the World's Sunday School Association.

  (d) The United Stewardship Council of the United States and Canada and other similar groups more or less organized for promotional administration, publicity and like interests.

II. Looking toward what is known as organic union there are several groups, some of which are denominationally official and others voluntary. The World Conference on Faith and Order is a body for organic union officially constituted by the church bodies.

III. The Association of Executive Secretaries of State and Local Federations is a national body considering the unified local problems of federation.

IV. The Community Church Workers of the U. S. A. represents another form of local unity.

V. Voluntary organizations, originally of individuals, then of group organizations of individuals, which, however, have either the official or the tacit approval of the churches include: The American Bible Society, the National Council of the Young Men's Christian Association, the National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations, the two latter bodies being also sections of world organizations. Among the later bodies of a voluntary nature are the National Commission of Protestant Church Women and another representing brotherhoods and other men's organizations.

VI. Other national and world organizations having more or less sanction from the churches are the International and World Societies of Christian Endeavor and the World Alliance for the Promotion of International Friendship through the Churches. The Evangelical Alliance continues an active existence in Great Britain and some Continental countries and also a purely legal continuance in the United States.

Mention might be made of several other bodies for special interests, such as the American and Foreign Christian Union, which cares for the American Church in Paris. There are also, in the United States, separate organizations for particular foreign missions institutions in the field.

In addition to these there are several world organizations of denominational bodies.[1]

The above named bodies do not exhaust the list, and the same sort of diversity is manifested among the state and local federations of churches, brought about in part by differing local conditions and needs. It sometimes seems as though we had so many unities that we hardly know what to do with them. Consistent with the very genius of Protestantism, there is this wide variety of organization, consistent in a common aim. The general movement has made a most marvelous advance in many directions in the last quarter of a century. Progress has also been made in the organic union of homogeneous church bodies, and in the community church movement the local Christian constituency has taken matters into its own hands without much encouragement from overhead bodies and sometimes in defiance of them.

---

[1] See "International Christian Movements," by Charles S. Macfarland. Revell, 1924.

The situation, although complex, is not so confusing as might appear, but it does constitute a major problem of the immediate future. The voluntary bodies still have relatively little actual contact with or direction from the churches, even at times when approved or adopted as church agencies by several church bodies. The Young Men's Christian Association has its own coöperating committee with the church bodies, which, however, is unrelated to the national and world federated agencies of the churches except as it may at times coöperate or mutually consult with them. There is a very general feeling that there is a want of constructiveness in the whole movement for unity and that the time has come for a more articulate and manifest relationship if these several agencies and the churches which they represent are to be effective. It must be admitted that, while for the most part the various federated bodies have distinct and defined areas of service, it very often happens that there is considerable duplication in some directions and overlooking and neglect in others. It is for this reason that the Federal Council and the Home Missions Council and the Council for Women for Home Missions have recently entered into intimate relationship, and that several other bodies representing the administrative boards and departments of the denominations have been made corresponding members of the Executive Committee of the Federal Council. Many of the bodies of federated boards have duplicating departments of work which could far better accomplish common purposes and tasks if they were united in one agency.

When we come to consider the relationship between the movement for federal unity and that for organic unity, there has not only been absence of coöperation but little or no consultation and there are groups in each movement which are actually hostile to the other process. There is a considerable extent of difference in the attitude of denominations, federally or coöperatively associated, in their interpretation of these associations, and still wider diversity between groups within the movement for organic union, largely on questions of faith and order and on the question of relationship with the Roman Catholic Church. Thus are the "unitists" themselves divided and the multitude of conferences on the subject has indeed, at times, added to the confusion.

The Purpose of This Study

This volume will omit any vivid description of all the evils of disunion or disunity. They are fairly obvious, we all know them, and several volumes have already been written which describe them with eloquence and persuasion. We shall rather attempt to show how we are gradually but actually overcoming them. The time has not arrived for us to attempt a strict definition of what we mean by the terms "unity" and "union" or to elaborate a clearly defined program. The process of experimentation and inquiry must precede this effort.

Nor is it the purpose of this volume to become a critique of the movements and organizations for unity. That has been written for the local federations of churches by H. Paul

Douglass.[2] It may be observed, however, that Dr. Douglass tends to treat the local federated movement and its implications in the national and international movement for federal unity as though it were a finished ship which had not sailed sufficiently on its voyage. While his volume is a stimulating challenge to the whole movement and an animating study, the real truth of the matter is that for these twenty years perhaps, we have been able to do little more than partially build the ship, with a scarcity of workmen, a want of finished material, with occasional stormy days and even strikes of the working constituency. Perhaps our greatest achievement has been to commingle our sympathies.

We shall, rather, look ahead in the light of what has happened in the past, in order to indicate the future course. We may at least express the conviction, on the basis of past experience, that the movement toward unity or union, whichever we may choose to call it, is irresistible and we may anticipate the result of our study by saying here that the two movements, federal and organic, are gradually finding their way together into the federal channel, with its enlargement. Indeed the writer confesses that, when he began this volume, his purpose was only to record the growth and forecast the future of federal unity, but an early survey revealed the fact that the whole movement had reached a stage at which it was difficult, if not impossible to extricate the one form from the other. The effort to base Christian unity on the intellectual apprehension, or expression, of belief, miscalled "faith," or on tradition and supposedly historical modes of expression called "order," takes us back to the ancient disputatious councils of the church and the kind of unity which we should avoid. The unity we are seeking must have liberty and, therefore, it cannot be uniformity and identity, either of belief or symbolic expression. Any one who will be painstaking enough to study the creeds and forms of these to-be-united churches, as contained in twenty projected mammoth volumes can hardly be misled.[8]

---

[2] "Protestant Coöperation in American Cities" and "Church Comity," by H. Paul Douglass. Institute of Social and Religious Research.

We shall see that true liberty is the freedom to yield some freedom for the sake of the common good of the church and of mankind, or the freedom to discover and practice fellowship, unless we are to revert to disunity. This concession must not mean indifference to the eternal verities, but it recognizes that truth is many sided, and that no church, or indeed body of churches, possesses the whole truth. The feeling that we must not wait for unity until we can resolve all questions of the intellectual expression of faith and experience or until all questions of order have been satisfactorily adjusted, is rapidly growing, even among those who have not yet brought themselves to confess or express it. To thus wait would be to seek the effect before the cause.

The movement for the unity of the churches, in an organizational sense, must be recognized as but one element in Christian unity as a spiritual movement, often escaping our effort to describe or define it with exactness. This we already assume, as indeed it was assumed at Lausanne in 1927, but of course this spiritual unity must take human organizational form. The thesis of this volume is that we must start with the unity and union already existing, or, in other words, we must begin by considering the things that we know we have in common and which our experience and practice has proved that we have as mutual possessions, rather than with the discussion of the matters on which we differ. The readiness of the several church bodies concerned varies in their attitudes toward Christian unity, but on the whole it surely may be said that the chapter of this volume setting forth these attitudes would have been far from possible a quarter of a century ago. We have already gone a long way in establishing the reality of our unity in Christian faith, using the latter word in the sense in which Jesus used it, and in spiritual experience as well as in our common efforts for Christlike service together for humanity.

---

[8] *Corpus Confessionum;* edited by Prof. D. Cajus Fabricius of the University of Berlin with the coöperation of Principal A. E. Garvie, Archbishop Germanos, Dr. Arthur C. Headlam, Bishop of Gloucester, Dr. Adolf Keller and Charles S. Macfarland, now appearing serially, collates the creeds and confessions of the major bodies of the world. The volume relating to the Methodist Episcopal Church alone consists of over 700 pages.

The chief question at issue just now is to find the form of unity that is desirable and practicable to meet the present state of the churches. The assumption that one great centralized body on the pattern of Rome, with authority and supervisory power, is either desirable or possible, may, as has been said, well be set aside. But we are dealing with an irresistible set of forces which, with patient thinking and experience in practice are leading us, by the Spirit of God, towards an end which we do not yet clearly see and which can be determined only by experience.

While this volume makes its main distinction between federal unity and organic unity, this is only because these have been two rather distinct terms on the part of the advocates of each. The one tends to emphasize the mission of the church, the other the nature of the church; one is the more concerned with experience, the other with definitions. If there is to be a large place given to the religious experience of Christians and to the world-mission of the church, there must be amplitude in all our definitions. As a matter of fact, of course, federal unity may and probably will become increasingly organic, as has been the case in the development of the federal government of the United States. Indeed, it should be noted that the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America has had a steady organic development. While a further distinction might be made between coöperation and federal unity, in reality the former easily becomes simply a preface to the latter, which is its normal and inevitable fulfillment. History ever gives birth to prophecy.

The preamble of the plan of federation of the Federal Council fails to express one of the great inherent motives which moved the men who organized it. There was a motive really for something more than mere coöperative working together in fellowship. This impulse was somewhat undefinedly expressed in the phrase, "to express the fellowship and catholic unity of the Church of Christ." Although during two decades of its history the Council's service in the field of human life has been the most noticeable, there has been, nevertheless, underneath it all a sense of spiritual unity, of which the Council has become increasingly conscious, but has seldom attempted to formulate. The time has doubtless come, after these twenty and more years of deepening fellowship in service, when the Council may be ready to reveal and emphasize more largely the other motive, "to express the fellowship and Catholic unity of the Church of Christ." In any event, the Federal Council and the form of unity of which it is the outstanding expression, are the main stream and therefore warrant the major consideration accorded to them in this volume, as we seek to translate their history into prophecy.

CHAPTER II

AN HISTORICAL REVIEW

Church historians[1] at times have divided church history into the following sections: Missions, Polity, Doctrine, Christian Life, Christian Worship. It would perhaps be difficult to estimate on how many of these objectives the churches have more or less unity already or how much they will have, but it would probably be accurate to say that on at least two of them, namely, Christian Life and Christian Worship, using the latter term in its larger and truer spiritual sense, they are now one in spirit and experience, and that, while varying in method, they are united in the sphere of missions as the duty of world evangelization, and in large measure, on the Christian message to mankind. Indeed, the church today is far more united in these than ever before in its history, since the earliest days of the apostles, for, as we shall see, the assumption of such unity in the church of the period of the so-called ecumenical councils is far from valid. They are obviously very much divided, as yet, on polity and doctrine and in forms and symbols of worship.

The Teaching of Jesus

However we may interpret the genesis of the church as an organization, it began spiritually with the ministry of Jesus. It must be admitted that on most of the concrete problems now hindering the modern movement for unity Jesus gave us little, if any, direct or explicit light or instruction. Indeed, perhaps it should be said that in becoming so disunited the Church and the churches have wandered away from Jesus rather than drawn closer to him. Jesus, above all, gave freedom from laws and ordinances, from the repressions of race, nation and sect, and enfranchised his followers from both ecclesiastical and governmental rulers in matters concerning their spiritual life. Had he attempted to establish form and organization it could have been valid only for his own day and not for ours. One might think of the churches as constituting the arc of a circle, with Jesus in the center. The nearer they come to him the closer they come together. The most careful study of the teaching of Jesus, however, fails to give us any appreciable help on intricate and philosophical questions of doctrine or on those of polity, as these have been humanly developed and as they exist at the present moment. The Master, however, constantly warned against divisiveness, both by precept and parable, and he frequently called attention to spiritual possessions that men had in common, despite their diversity.

---

[1] "History of the Christian Church," by George P. Fisher. Scribners, 1893.

Jesus set forth no program of Christian social activities, no form of organization, and nothing that could be called a creed or confession, as we find these in the ancient councils or in the volumes to which reference has been made, "Corpus Confessionum." He imparted a life and a spirit to the disciples. His truths are not left to us formulated into a system of theology. Indeed, it must be remembered that he never left anything in written form. He did tell his disciples what their relationship to one another should be, and that they were to be one in him as he was one with the Father. He taught them to pray, but elaborated no philosophy of prayer. It is only in experience, worship and service that we can look to Jesus for light. How these should be expressed in terms of intellect, organization and program, each succeeding age is left to determine by its own environment under the guidance of the Spirit.

Jesus recognized baptism, although he himself did not perform that rite for others. The Fourth Gospel represents John as saying of Jesus, in contrast to himself and his baptizing with water, "the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost." On this baptism Christians have never differed. The Lord's Supper was a very simple observance, without any eucharistic doctrine, to be partaken in communion, in memory of Jesus, and it is among the ironies of history that this ordinance, established for the purpose of manifesting the unity of the disciples with the Master and with one another, should appear, after twenty centuries of Christian experience, as perhaps the most divisive element in all our diversities.

In the last sacred hours of the Master's life he magnified and beautified human service by washing the disciples' feet, and when he went down from the Mountain of Transfiguration he led them together into a life of human service by healing men of their diseases.

Jesus imparted to his disciples the spirit of unity, with profound underlying principles of truth and life which were to preserve it. His teaching also gives us the basis of a social gospel, which as we shall see, implies and necessitates Christian unity. Inasmuch as the social implications of the gospel of Jesus have been so largely the objectives of modern movements for unity, it is important to realize their significance. His constant use of the term "Kingdom of Heaven" implies what we now term the "social order," with its spiritual and Christian meaning. Jesus rescued the individual from the unsocial institutionalism of his day and, by his lofty evaluation of personality, instituted a new social ideal, for social redemption is, above all, the freeing of personality. Human society as he visualized it was to be spiritual in character. His society was to be one in which men were to serve one another and not to exploit each other. His disciples were "sent" by him to help in realizing this "Kingdom of Heaven." His gospel annihilated class distinctions. In a recent article,[2] Professor Goguel, by a new approach, shows us again that in the teachings of Jesus there is implicit a universal Christianity. A universal Christianity is necessarily social to the highest degree.

As will be pointed out later on, we have discovered that the social task of Christianity cannot be performed by an unsocially divided Christian Church. Indeed, the very divisions of the Church have often been created and deepened just because groups of Christians have separated on lines of social caste, on national, racial and economic classifications. Worse still, these religious divisions have tended to aggravate and increase the havoc of a social system to which the churches have yielded. Thus the social teaching of Jesus implies, assumes and necessitates Christian unity.

No argument is needed to reveal the attitude of Jesus toward laws, forms and ceremonies. He observed those of the synagogue, but subordinated their outward expression to human needs, including, for example, Sabbath observance. Above all, he exalted inward spirituality, and Paul is expressing the mind of Christ when he tells the church at Corinth that God "hath made us able ministers of the new testament, not of the letter, but of the spirit, for the letter killeth but the spirit giveth life." Jesus, also, in his frequent use of Old Testament prophecy,[3] sustained the constant attitude of the prophets rather than that of priestly literalness as to formulas and observances and bequeathed this liberty to his disciples.

His affirmations of truth are clear and unmistakable. They do not require dialectical proficiency. The fatherhood and sovereignty of God, the Kingdom of Heaven, visible and invisible, his own sonship, the gift of the Holy Spirit, the nature of sin, the eternal life—these and other articles of faith are so simple that his followers need be neither theologians nor the bond-servants of theologians. These will be considered in another chapter, as the message of Christian unity. Upon these fundamental verities themselves, Christians are not divided.

---

[2] "Jésus et les origines de l'universalisme chrétien." Maurice Goguel. *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses.* Mai-Juin, 1932.

[3] "Jesus and the Prophets," by Charles S. Macfarland. Putnam, 1905.

THE EARLY APOSTOLIC CHURCH

The apostolic church had no supreme ecclesiastical judicatory, no official head, no unanimity of doctrine. There were probably differences of opinion and practice at least equal to many which exist today. Despite the widely scattered locations of the Christian groups, there was unity of name and consciousness,[4] unity of faith in Jesus as the Redeemer and a common observance of the Lord's Supper. Institutions and forms of worship, doctrine and order were subject to the social conditions of a later and more complex situation.

To a considerable extent the early disciples continued this simplicity, for at least a time, without any constraint of liberty, so long as they preached the simple evangelizing message of Jesus, and if we consider Pentecost as the beginning of the organization of the church, with its speaking of unknown tongues, we may regard the organization of the church as inducing a diversity which later developed into disunity, brought about, of course, as the Gospel was introduced among the diverse elements of men who had no experience of personal discipleship with Jesus, and whose thinking was largely directed by differing philosophies of life and conduct. Creeds and doctrines were then and always have been the result of rationalizing processes, often determined by cultural considerations.

---

[4] This common consciousness was strikingly interpreted by Carl Ludwig Schmidt in the brochure recounting the addresses given in recognition of the ecumenical service of Adolf Deissmann a few years ago.

Thus what is known as the Apostolic Age reveals to us the beginning or presentiment of actual disunion. The apostolic idea of unity at the beginning evidently presupposed diversity and liberty. This is manifest both in the Acts and the Epistles. The bond of union was that of fellowship. They were one body with many differing members, all essential to the body. There were "diversities of gifts," but one spirit. The Apostle Paul was continually urging the churches to avoid the loss of unity either by uniformity or by division. At the same time he constantly pleaded in behalf of liberty. He himself became "all things to all men."

The author of the Fourth Gospel diverged frequently from Paul in his views but both Paul and he were, at many points, at one with the Gnostics who later were generally recognized as heretics. Paul was somewhat mystical while the evangelist's faith was highly philosophical in its expression.[5] The New Testament is far from giving us a common philosophy and its differing viewpoints have been the sources of centuries of study, with widely varying interpretations. At the same time, fundamentally it has given us a common purpose and intent of Christianity, so universal that the Christian gospel has made its way in spite of the confusion in the minds of men from age to age. On this gospel as a means of salvation and a way of life, unity has survived all institutional division.

Misguided zeal on the part of the associates and followers of the apostles immediately ensued. Some were so earnest for unity that they suppressed diversity and secured uniformity instead of unity. Division was induced by uniformity, and uniformity was reinforced by division, so that very soon there were three parties, or, we might say, three denominations in the early apostolic church—the extremely Jewish Christians, the Jewish Christians who took a more liberal attitude and the Pauline Christians. The Gentile Christians may be considered as a fourth division. We see, therefore, that the same elements and forces which now divide us were present near the very beginning. Perhaps the classic example is that revealed in Paul's message to the church in Corinth, where the very life of the church was threatened by those who declared themselves as of Paul or of Cephas or of Apollos, while as in hostility to them are those who declare "I am of Christ." Judging by later and modern examples it is not unlikely that those who proclaimed themselves as "of Christ" may have been farthest from his spirit. Evidently, from the first Epistle to the Corinthians, Paul regarded these parties as equally in error. Those who were "of Christ" took the name of the Master simply as a party slogan, using it to create the spirit of division. Paul's words to the church were, "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . that there be no divisions among you. . . . Is Christ divided? . . . I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual but as unto carnal, as unto babes in Christ, for ye are yet carnal, for whereas there is among you jealousy and strife are ye not carnal?"

---

[5] While the Fourth Gospel does not mention the church by name, in the writer's practical interest in unity, he endeavors to set forth its basis on the authority of Jesus (17:20).

In the year 49 A.D. the first Council on Christian Unity was held at Jerusalem. James, the brother of the Lord, was its president. Immediate division was averted and, as the letter ensuing from the Council intimated, it was due to the presence and influence of the Holy Spirit. (Acts xv.)

Perhaps the best recent interpretation of the Apostle Paul's conception of unity is that of Professor Frank Chamberlin Porter.[6] Paul, according to Professor Porter, had a creed himself and a rather positive one. He earnestly deplored, however, the spiritual pride and exclusiveness of the adherents of a creed. The words of Paul to our own generation of Lutherans and Calvinists would be "Let no one glory in man, for all things are yours, whether Paul or Apollos or Cephas." Not only are Paul, Apollos and Cephas shared by them all, but in such a way that to make them divisive is contrary to the spirit of Christ.

---

[6] "The Mind of Christ in Paul," by Frank Chamberlin Porter. Scribners, 1930.

So far as any doctrinal basis for Christianity is concerned, a recent volume[7] exhausts its treatment in relation to Jesus and Paul in less than thirty pages. Jesus simply summoned men to repentance, announced the coming of the Kingdom, declared what they needed to repent of and the kind of righteousness they should seek. Indeed, one of his chief emphases was on the value of justice, mercy and fidelity, rather than the tithing of mint, anise and cummin.

The essentials of Christian faith with both Jesus and Paul were simple and were not involved in philosophic speculation, although Paul himself was the great thinker of the early church and at times ventured to philosophize.

Any thoughtful study of the church in the first century also makes it clear that no church polity or order can assert its primariness with the primitive church. What is known as church order has been the adaptation of the church to its particular environment, to mental or temperamental attitudes, forms of state government and more or less practical need. Doubtless Congregational, Presbyterian and Episcopal forms can all claim apostolic sanction at certain points of time or place in the early Church, but no one of them is exclusively original and all are more or less adventitious. Claims of priority are much like asking special seats on the right and left hand in the Kingdom. (Matthew xx:21.)

As Professor Frank C. Porter has also made evident, Paul met questions of religious creed in his day by exhorting the apostolic church to be intellectually and spiritually humble. This was especially true when he discussed the question of Christology, Paul's only concern being that they should have a *love* like Christ's. They must live in his spirit, and if they violated that spirit they sinned against him, even when they were uttering exalted sayings about him.

---

[7] "A History of Christian Thought," by Arthur C. McGiffert. Scribners, 1932.

The twelfth chapter of First Corinthians is a sufficient charter of unity, for all time.

THE ECUMENICAL COUNCILS

Two greatly differing types of religion, however, existed in the early church. Some of the apologists were moral philosophers who developed in Christianity systems of abstract truths, greatly to the loss of the previous simplicity and clearness which others conserved. The struggle for liberty of thought never ceased.

The age of uniformity through the suppression of diversity and liberty is that of the so-called ecumenical councils of the church after it began to possess material power, the first of these being largely by the instigation of the Emperor Constantine, who had little or no concern for the matters in dispute, but wanted to avoid any ecclesiastical differences which might divide his empire. Indeed, the actions at these councils were often induced, not only by philosophic speculation but also with consideration as to their practicable effect on the Roman Empire and its autocracy. Indeed, the relation between church and state, in itself, foreboded failure for spiritual unity. For the most part the councils were characterized by violent disputations, and, while they secured a seeming outward unity, they in reality created or increased schisms and often gave strength to the very heresy that they condemned. In other words, uniformity and division resulted instead of liberty and unity. It was not a happy period in the life of the church and its leaders went far astray in these respects from the discipleship of Jesus and of the early church of the disciples.

The so-called Apostles' Creed came into being as late as the middle of the second century, and obviously was not an adequate symbol expressing the faith of the apostles. Indeed it omits the outstanding features of Christianity as we find them in the New Testament. This early dogmatic formula was used as a polemical weapon; it was not a summary of the faith of the early church, and was far from being a commensurate statement of the teaching of Jesus.

Paul's spirituality and the earlier trust in a living present and continuing Holy Spirit, as promised by Jesus, yielded, in these councils, to an assumption of infallibility ascribed to their decrees, which was later transferred to the Pope. In dispute after dispute, in council after council, the merits of important questions were confused with political and often selfish personal interests. Indeed, in one of the most significant of creed-forming councils, that of Chalcedon, the victory was political rather than theological.

Finally came the separation between the eastern and western or the Greek and Latin churches in 1054, which was caused by both practical considerations and philosophic speculation. Thus the Catholic Church itself lost both unity and uniformity and we have the unedifying spectacle of Pope and Patriarch mutually excommunicating one another. But division also continued in the western or Roman Church. Heresies abounded, there being over a hundred of them, which the church vainly sought at times to extinguish by the carnal measures of physical warfare. All the succeeding attempts to reunite these two sections of the church up to our own day have failed, although at the present time the Pope of Rome is making earnest approaches with this evident purpose.

During this unhappy period, creeds were formed, reformed, revised and rerevised. Positions contradicting each other were at times taken in different councils. The spirit of conflict animated them. One pope declared of one of the councils, that of the year 449, that it was a "council of robbers." Uniformity was attained by force and sustained by persecution. It must be thus admitted that the lessons of the ecumenical councils and of the history of the church following them, up to the time of the Reformation, make clear the disastrous effect on unity of the suppression of liberty and the insistence upon uniformity, both in doctrine, often miscalled "faith," and in what is known as "order." While the Catholic Church emerged in outward unity, it was far from the early apostolic ideal. Oftentimes during these councils, double interpretations of articles of the creeds were understood, this being done in the case of the Nicene Creed, in order to hold one great leader and his followers to the church.

While the moral and spiritual effects of these efforts for unity were by no means gratifying, it should be added that during this period the church produced many men of saintly lives and earnest followers of Jesus. The saving element in these ancient symbols is that there was religious faith in them as well as philosophic conclusion. Their permanent value is in the religion they so imperfectly express and not in the metaphysical expression of it. Professor McGiffert says of the most outstanding of the creeds on the most significant article of it: "the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity contains both a religious and a philosophical element, the former rooted in Christian faith, the latter the product of metaphysics." We shall need to bear this in mind as, farther on, we consider modern efforts to find unity on a creedal basis. Moreover, it should be remembered that, despite these ecclesiastical divisions, the church went on developing the Christian lives of multitudes of men and women, instituting works of love, charity and mercy, an imperfect human instrument used of God. When, however, we use the term "reunion" as our aim, we assume a fallacy, and when we seek to find our way by following the modes and methods of the ancient councils, we are likely, like them, to go wrong. During these fifteen centuries there never was true unity. The assumption that it was attained and then lost by the Reformation is unhistorical.

The Reformation Period

This growth of centralized government and its denial of human liberty, together with the results of it in both faith and morals, finally produced the reaction which led to the Protestant Reformation. It must be confessed, however, that the newly found and enlarged liberty of the children of the church also led again to divisiveness, largely, of course, a reaction against the uniformity induced by the previous autocratic methods. There was an immediate division in Europe which led to the development of two branches, the Lutheran and the Reformed. Disputes developed between the original reformers, Luther and Zwingli. To these was soon added a third type of reform consisting of those known as radicals, several in number and diverse in objective. Peacemakers like Bucer then failed, and the final break between Luther and Zwingli occurred at Marburg in 1529 on a metaphysical difference of view on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. What Bucer attempted, however, promises realization in our day. The spirit of those days is illustrated by the refusal of Martin Luther to shake hands with Zwingli, as they parted. The Reformed Churches meanwhile developed under John Calvin and his associates. The fact is sometimes overlooked that Luther did try again for reconciliation. Meanwhile Calvin and Zwingli, under the influence of another peacemaker, Bullinger, fortunately united on the second Helvetian Confession, so that one division was prevented.

From this point on and extending to our day and generation there has been a constant multiplicity of denominations and sects. Philosophic ideas, customs, mere political influences, national and racial characteristics and very often the outstanding personal influence of striking leaders rallied large groups of men and women very much in allegiance to these personalities rather than to any very clear-cut moral or spiritual principles. The causes of these divisions have greatly varied. The divisions following the Reformation also came from many and varied sources; church polities and politics, differences in philosophy and theology, varying attitudes toward the purposes of the Reformation itself, divergencies in temperament, national ideals and ideas, educational and social backgrounds, and perhaps more especially the temper and spirit of intense, high-powered reformers, playing again the rôle of Apollos and Cephas. There had, indeed, been other differences between Luther and Zwingli of a more or less political nature, as well as other confessional questions than that of the sacrament. The political forces, in themselves, were perhaps sufficient to cause divisiveness in religious views.

The efforts of John Calvin toward union are of especial interest. He sought the convening of a general council, but was soon involved in violent controversy himself. The situation was not infrequently made more difficult by personal suspicions of one leader of another. Calvin was accused of being an ecclesiastical politician. Thus whether Calvin's efforts, if successful, would have brought real unity or have created an autocracy can hardly be determined.

The story of Reformation and Post-Reformation efforts to escape division is of deep interest and conveys lessons for the present day. The constant attempt to compress the Christian message into dogmatic forms was abortive. Nevertheless, the ideal of unity was persistent. Efforts continued after Calvin's death, and later the great jurist, Hugo Grotius, wrote a volume on "The Way to Ecclesiastical Peace."

This period would bear fuller study and it has been adequately treated in many histories of the Reformation.

The Post-Reformation Period

This divisiveness continued and deepened through the post-reformation period. There were, however, many individual and political efforts to restore unity in both church and state and to insure religious peace, both in the Roman Catholic Church and among the Protestant bodies, mainly consisting of the two main branches, the Lutheran and Reformed. Attempts were also made in the sixteenth century, on the initiative of political authorities, to bring about peace between Roman Catholics and Protestants.

Among the motives for the attempts at Protestant union were to build up a defense against ritualistic tendencies and the aggression of the Roman Catholic autocracy and the desire for unity and uniformity in the interest of political peace. This was attempted by various methods, the convening of councils, not altogether different from those of the early church, and mandates from civil authorities who sought to induce political order by religious unity. There were many endeavors to differentiate between non-essential and essential matters in doctrine, to find those things which all held in common and not only to induce a change of emphasis from doctrines and institutional forms but to substitute genuine religious experience in the spirit of Christ. Unfortunately, these efforts for the most part did little more than induce a sort of toleration, which often became largely religious indifference. The lessons of the post-reformation age, like those of the previous period, would seem to be that dogma and ecclesiastical institutionalism prohibit unity in any large sense. While the church had the unity of uniformity, with the loss of liberty, previous to the Reformation, we now realize that during these latter four hundred years we have had liberty, not only with the loss of uniformity, but at the expense of our essential unity.

During this period, however, certain outstanding religious leaders and teachers prophesied, as early as the seventeenth century, some of the procedures which are now bringing the churches together. Among these was Richard Baxter. He described the seventeenth century as "a contentious, dividing age." He set forth a very simple statement of belief and declared in a treatise on Christian union that the main force to bring it about was foreign missions.[7] Another less known prophet of that day was a Scotch Calvinist, Duraeus,[8] who published a substantial document on Christian unity.

These voices appear to have been given little heed and on the whole the post-reformation period bequeathed to us a multiplicity of denominations and sects, leaving, however, so far as Europe was concerned, the Lutheran and Reformed bodies as the main religious institutions. The following period witnessed the rise of many more sects and denominations, in Continental Europe and Great Britain, and their transplanting in the new colonies of the United States, where they were re-multiplied up to and partly including the nineteenth century. Thus we note an almost unrestrained divisive procedure during three or four centuries.

LESSONS TO BE LEARNED

But again, we must not lose sight of the facts that the churches continued to produce Christian lives, that often the new divisions were humanly unescapable, that the churches were, again by the hand of God, making the world better, that even these divisions brought new light on the nature of the Christian gospel. It was all, in large measure, the search for spiritual liberty, and the vicissitudes of the churches were largely conditioned by social and political environment. New groups were sometimes the means of recalling the church to its mission and arousing it from lethargy. Such was the Wesleyan movement, for example.

---

[7] "Universal Concord." 1660.

[8] An article by Prof. J. M. Batten, in "Church History," Dec., 1932, on "John Dury, Advocate of Christian Reunion," is of especial interest.

We need, however, to remind ourselves that many reasons or excuses then more valid, are not applicable to our own day and generation. What have we, in this history, to guide us in our search today, from these experiences in the life of the Christian church? From the later periods we have much to learn by their lessons of failure. From the early apostolic period we have the lesson of simplicity as a necessity to unity and of liberty, rather than authority, as its safeguard. But have we no light from Jesus himself, whereby to interpret and apply his gospel to our changing institutional life? Yes, we have one and perhaps only one. We are not left "comfortless." He left us the gift of the Holy Spirit to guide us into the truth. The Holy Spirit is not a designation of intellectual perception for the formulation of creeds, encompassed by forms, ceremonials and symbols.

Again and again, age after age, men have been possessed with the idea that at last they had gotten divine truth enclosed and finally contained. We feel today, however, that this cannot be achieved until all things are possible to man as well as God. The fault has been that one or two, or a very few, of the methods which were designed to lead men to faith have themselves become the objects of faith, the means became the end and the partial and temporary were conceived of as if complete and eternal.

Christian revelation is thus not confined to a closed canon, to a stereotyped letter, or a strictly defined confession. It is the immanence and continuity of that Spirit in the soul who inspired the writers of the Book, and bears witness to the truth in it. Thus did Christ declare that the only unpardonable sin was that of denying to one's self, or of precluding to any human soul, the influences of the Holy Ghost. Our intellectual forms of faith are but attempts to express, in the language of human reasoning, the feelings of the human heart, to search out the unsearchable and to express the inexpressible. All such symbols are good and helpful, but they can never be perfect until the knowledge of man is equal to the knowledge of God.

Schleiermacher gave us a new order of thought in declaring the religion of the heart to be the irreducible fact of experience, anterior to any religious theory or form of doctrine which can only imperfectly express it. The common error of both rationalist and supernaturalist was in considering faith as a form of doctrine, which the rationalist thought might be deduced from reason as a purely intellectual operation, and the supernaturalist believed to have fallen, at a given point in time, from heaven. And both came to reduce religion and revelation to the contents of an intellectual operation.

The newer order of thought is that man receives life from God, reacts to it, and then, in trying to express that life in words, makes his own belief. This is not to deny the reaction of belief upon life. But life is ever larger than any one expression of it—indeed, than all expressions. The attempt to interpret the life has been treated as though it were the life which it imperfectly expresses. Hence all dogmas, doctrines and orthodoxies in relation to Scripture, to Christ and the religious life of man are but the imperfect intellectual translations of the common religious consciousness of the race. Thus no one man, no body of men, can give that inner life perfect expression in terms of the mind. Such could only be gained by bringing together the religious consciousness of every human being of every race. In view of such a colossal task how marvelous has been the intellectual and moral self-sufficiency, not only of popes, but of councils of religious men!

Jesus said, "It is expedient for you that I go away." "But I come again, and will receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also." He it is who leads his own beyond the outer Gentile court of institutions, beyond the mediating sanctuaries, to the very Holy of holies, where the individual soul in the inviolable solitude of its personality stands face to face with the divine reality, and all are there, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. The Holy Spirit denotes and expresses life and experience, whether toward man or toward God. We must then find our way farther back than Reformation, Council or even Apostolic Church, to Jesus and his bequest of the Spirit. Only the unity of the Spirit is the bond of peace.

Indeed, we may find Canon Raven, Rufus Jones and John Oman,[9] of our own day and generation, more helpful, for today, than the ancient councils, the early fathers, or the reformers, for they tell us much of this Holy Spirit as our own possession. We may learn as much as the ancient and later councils learned and also learn much more, for unity is not to be found by submission to the very authority that failed in the search for it, as will be pointed out in a later chapter. Thus we must go both farther back and farther forward, than the period of the ecumenical councils, in our search for unity with diversity and liberty. This is the lesson we learn from a review of history.

---

[9] "Jesus and the Gospel of Love," by Charles E. Raven. Henry Holt & Co., 1931. "Pathways to the Reality of God," by Rufus M. Jones. Macmillan, 1931. "The Natural and the Supernatural," by John Oman. Macmillan, 1931.

CHAPTER III

THE INFLUENCES AND IMPULSIONS FOR AND AGAINST UNITY AND ITS GENESIS IN THE UNITED STATES

With the foregoing historical lessons in mind we may approach the earlier history of denominationalism and the beginnings of its integration in the United States. In considerable measure we inherited all these divisions. Moreover, our widely differentiated groups of population, coming from various sections of the Old World, lent themselves with prompt facility to the processes of religious divisiveness from the very beginning. This was partly due to the fact that these people had come here seeking both civil and religious liberty, and they carried that freedom to sad extremes in religion. It was a limited group liberty. The other fundamental law of the universe was lost—the spirit of essential unity. From the beginning and onward up to the nineteenth century religious denominations were created, then divided, and then subdivided again. This story is so familiar that no historical résumé is necessary, our main interest being in the present and future.

The diversity of church organization and life in the United States needs to be considered, however, in perspective and with insight and sympathy. It is a phase of the complexity that characterizes the social life of the new world and was largely brought about by the same influences. It is inherent in our adventurous democratic spirit. There is, moreover, a homogeneity that is obscured by organizational division. In other words, things have not been and are not even now as bad as they would appear in a hasty review of the Religious Census of the United States. The tendency to put the Christian leaders of the past and the bodies which they brought into being, into a sort of criminal class, is to be deprecated. Allowance must be made for those human diversities—racial, geographical, linguistic, temperamental and even convictional elements inherent in human nature itself.

The early period of American religious history, characterized by the intensification of the inherited divisions, induced in all too large measure by the misuse and misdirection of the new freedom, paralleled the political divisiveness and indeed was intricate in it. Later on, in the nineteenth century, the same divisive process among the churches, both between and within families of churches, was brought about over slavery and secession.

The earlier separations in the eighteenth century were so intense that even the so-called Great Awakening of religion not only failed to unite churches and groups, but at times intensified hostilities. The new converts themselves were so zealous that they formed new groups. Moreover, there were new schisms created by differing judgments as to the revival and to revivalism in general, due largely to a revivalistic zeal which was "without knowledge."

The organized reaction to this religious separatism and the search for Christian unity constituted a forward cycle in evolution, beginning about a hundred years ago. This brings us to consider the influences and impulsions both for and against it and a study of the early approaches to religious unity. The impeding factors are mainly of two natures, those arising from the history and the traditions of denominations and those which represent diversity in religious conviction, temperament and modes of experience, or rather the expression of it.

Carlyle, when he was informed that Margaret Fuller had decided to accept the universe, replied, with his customary curtness, "Gad, she'd better!" We need first of all to accept the situation as we find it, or at least recognize it. There are obstacles to be overcome which go back into the very origin of the life and being of these various churches. Unity calls for constitutional action, and this always takes time and patience. The denominations own large amounts of property and recent experiences in dealing with this factor in Scotland and Canada must be taken into account, especially when what is known as organic union is sought. There are all sorts of personal elements, temperament, emotion and sentiment and many ties of loyalty to be reckoned with. There are also real differences of religious conviction and expressions of experience. Religion at its best is empirical. Then, of course, there are the bonds and traditions handed down from father and mother to son and daughter. There are wide differences as to the constitutional nature of the church, illustrated by the two extremes of churches having the episcopate and those where the local congregation is the independent and deciding authority. There are, finally, the time-honored creeds including the conception of Baptism and the Sacrament. All of these elements have found their way into the very life of the churches, so that very often any attempt to remove them violently would mean the destruction of the church body with its members left in no-man's land. Indeed there have been hasty efforts for consolidation which at times have increased disagreement and division or induced a sort of tolerative indifference. In some instances, a minority of one body will organize a new sect, claiming to be the original body.

As we shall see, these opposing motives are gradually disappearing, due in part to our migratory habits by which church members pass with more and more freedom from the local church of one denomination into another. Over against all of these deterrent factors we have at the present moment forces which are daily becoming stronger and which further the movement toward unity. There is a deepening consciousness everywhere of our unity of spirit, message and aim. There is a strong sense of the need in human affairs of a united church or of its unity of impact. We have, as we shall see later, during the past quarter of a century and more, been discovering by experience the possibilities of larger unity.

On the whole, up to the present moment, the main difficulty has been the want of any clear comprehension as to the kind of unity we should seek. Perhaps the strongest influence toward unity is our increasing understanding of the nature and constitution of the unity which is possible and practical, through experience in its practice.

THE EARLY VOLUNTARY MOVEMENTS TOWARD UNITY

We will now go back a century and trace the processes and progress by which we have revealed our present unity in spirit and attained it in practice. The movement, like the Reformation, originated with great souls, individually and in groups. It is not altogether easy to trace this development because it began at so many different points and although all of these various efforts have had a common goal, it has not always been clearly defined and has been sought by different roads.

Beginning with the early part of the nineteenth century, probably the first manifestation of unity was one which included both sentiment and practicality, namely, the evangelizing spirit which culminated in the American Bible Society. A short time before the organization of the several Bible societies and the American Bible Society in the United States, similar organizations were instituted in Great Britain leading up to the British and Foreign Bible Society. Preceding the national organization, in the United States, several regional Bible societies were organized. The American Bible Society was formed in 1816 "for the circulation of the Holy Scriptures without note or comment." The phrase "without note or comment" was obviously necessary to unity in that day and generation. Here was a beginning of concord manifested in meeting a common responsibility on a universally accepted symbol, by avoiding controversial issues. The dominant spirit of sectarianism was such at that time as to call for a tribute to the valiant spirits who were able to overcome it to this extent, for we are told that, if a prayer was offered, either liturgically or extemporaneously, in a board meeting, there were always some present who were not able to say "Amen"; and shortly after the organization, while the reading of the Scriptures was permitted at the meetings, it was decided "to discontinue the exercises of prayer and preaching" and "thereby avoid all interference with the various opinions of members regarding the forms of religious worship." While the question of prayer at the meetings came up again later, it was decided that there "should be no religious exercises beside the reading of a portion of Scripture." Let us note what a tremendous advance we have made from that beginning.

The Sunday School movement, from its very inception, began to foster a spirit of unity. The Sunday School organizations appeared first in local areas, the oldest one still existing being the Sunday School Society of Philadelphia, which was organized in 1791. The desire for a comprehensive body was realized in the organization of the American Sunday School Union in 1817, whose objects included that of cultivating "unity and Christian charity among those of different names." This body still continues, although its work has been largely superseded by other institutions of religious education. From this time onward the Sunday School movement has had many interdenominational phases. Among the earliest of world Christian gatherings were those of the Sunday Schools. These have had their influence in preparing the way for the world movement for federal unity. The later International Lesson Committee also antedated federation in the preparation of common lessons for the Sunday Schools.

In 1825, the American Tract Society was instituted. Meanwhile many currents and forces began to operate, among them the revival movements of the nineteenth century and the great reform movements, including that for temperance. Perhaps the nearest approach to the modern federative movement was that of the unions of ministers of cities and other local areas for prayer and conference and increasingly for social and civic needs.[1] The tendency toward union services, on Thanksgiving Day and other national occasions, and united observance of such institutions as the Week of Prayer, steadily increased. Indeed, at times the clergymen assumed to represent their churches in common and simultaneous utterance or action on the social and civic problems of the community.

Perhaps the earliest movement for union, devoted to that one purpose, was the American Association for the Promotion of Christian Union on Apostolic Principles, in 1839. It languished for several years, largely due to ecclesiastical difficulties and conflicts among the Presbyterian churches, but was revived early in 1846 and issued an "Overture for Christian Union," whose proposals were largely identical with those now embodied in the Federal Council.

The Evangelical Alliance

We now come, however, to the body which was in largest measure the precursor of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and associated coöperative movements. This movement did not originate in America, as the World Evangelical Alliance preceded the branch established in the United States. At the same time the leadership in this great body came largely from our own country. Indeed, it is necessary at this point to call attention to the great Lutheran leader, Samuel Schmucker. As early as 1838 he had issued a fraternal appeal to the American churches urging an alliance of the several Protestant bodies which would not disturb their denominational organization and would enable them to render united service. He reissued it in 1870.[2] It is interesting to note the leadership of a Lutheran in these early days in view of the present conservative attitude of some of our Lutheran bodies. Dr. Schmucker's plan really anticipated the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America as it was to be an official confederation of the various denominations.

---

[1] These influences began early and have continued throughout all this period, largely through the personalities of outstanding pastors. The writer personally recalls the wide service of David O. Mears in his several pastorates. The list of such contributors to unity would be a long one.

Associated with the name of Dr. Schmucker should be that of Philip Schaff of the Reformed Church in the United States, whose personality exerted great influence later on. At one of the meetings of the Evangelical Alliance, in an address on "The Reunion of Christendom" Dr. Schaff gave a prophetic definition of federal unity or union:

> "Federal or confederate union is a voluntary association of different churches in their official capacity, each retaining its freedom and independence in the management of its internal affairs, but all recognizing one another as sisters with equal rights and cooperating in general enterprises, such as the spread of the Gospel at home and abroad, the defence of the faith against infidelity, the elevation of the poor and neglected classes of society, works of philanthropy and charity and moral reform."

Indeed, a similar proposal to that of Dr. Schmucker was made, in 1844, by Leonard Bacon of New Haven, for a world conference of the "evangelical bodies" which he termed an "ecumenical council."

---

[2] "The True Unity of Christ's Church." By S. S. Schmucker. Randolph, 1870.

The Evangelical Alliance, however, holding its first session in London, in 1846, became a body for the promotion of unity by individual Christians without any organized attempt at reaching the churches as official bodies, as this was not considered then practical.

As an indication of the manner in which great movements arise from different sources at the same moment, it is interesting to note that while Dr. Schmucker and his associates were arranging for a meeting on unity in New York in 1846, they received letters of invitation requesting the appointment of delegates to a gathering to be held in London that same year to consider the founding of the World's Evangelical Alliance. At the London gathering there were several outstanding American religious leaders. Inasmuch as the history of the Evangelical Alliance has never been adequately written, it is appropriate to quote the action taken by a rising and unanimous vote at the London Convention:

> "That the members of this Conference are deeply convinced of the desirableness of forming a confederation, on the basis of great Evangelical principles held in common by them, which may afford opportunity to members of the Church of Christ of cultivating brotherly love, enjoying Christian intercourse, and promoting such other objects as they may hereafter agree to prosecute together; and they hereby proceed to form such a confederation, under the name of 'The Evangelical Alliance.'"

This body established a doctrinal basis whose articles were as follows:

"1. The Divine inspiration, authority, and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures;
"2. The right and duty of private judgment in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures;
"3. The unity of the Godhead, and the Trinity of persons therein;

"4. The utter depravity of human nature in consequence of the fall;
"5. The incarnation of the Son of God, his work of atonement for the sins of mankind, and his mediatorial intercession and reign;
"6. The justification of the sinner by faith alone;
"7. The work of the Holy Spirit in the conversion and sanctification of the sinner;
"8. The immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, the judgment of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ, with the eternal blessedness of the righteous, and the eternal punishment of the wicked;
"9. The divine institution of the Christian ministry, and the obligation and perpetuity of the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper."

Among the objects of the new body was the establishment of an annual world season of prayer, which has been continued to the present day.

In view of later considerations in this volume, attention may be called to the doctrinal element in both Dr. Schmucker's original plan and that of the Evangelical Alliance. It includes articles which, at least in their wording, would divide rather than unite if proposed today. Indeed, as we shall see, creedal statements so fluctuate from age to age that, except when confined to the simplest of terms, they fail as bonds or symbols for our essential spiritual unity and, unless love prevails, cause disunity.

Attention should be called at this point to a problem raised in the London meeting which indicates some of the difficulties inherent in the search for unity. It was proposed, in establishing membership of the Alliance, to confine its members to those "not being slave holders." This came very near disrupting the new body at the start, and it was one of the reasons, if not the main reason, which delayed the organization of a branch of the Alliance in the United States until after the Civil War. As the result of this discussion the question of organization and membership in the national branches of the Alliance was left in their control.

Meanwhile, previous to the organization of the branch in the United States, international conferences were held in London in 1851, Berlin in 1857, Geneva in 1861, in all of which American delegates participated. Shortly before the fifth general conference of the Alliance, held in Amsterdam, the American branch was organized in New York, January 31, 1867. As one reviews the names of the personalities leading in this movement one is reminded of the Scripture passage, "there were giants in the earth in those days": Henry M. Field, Philip Schaff, Edwards J. Park, Howard Crosby, Samuel S. Schmucker, Theodore D. Woolsey, Samuel Irenaeus Prime, and many others who might be named, including the outstanding layman of that day, William E. Dodge, the elder, who became the first president of the American branch of the Alliance, serving until his death in 1883. Later he was succeeded by his son, of the same name, who served until 1903. As one surveys our present church life, it is difficult to discover any layman who fills the place that Mr. Dodge did in his day and generation.

In 1869 the general meeting of the World Evangelical Alliance was to have brought delegates from Europe to New York, but the war between France and Germany postponed this sixth conference of the World Alliance until 1873. Meanwhile, however, the American Alliance sent a delegation, including Philip Schaff, William E. Dodge and Cyrus W. Field, to Europe in answer to a letter from Switzerland in 1870 signed by over two hundred Christian leaders calling attention to the persecution of Protestants in Baltic Provinces.

Although perhaps unfortunately almost forgotten, except by our revered octogenarians, including Howard B. Grose, Frank Mason North and George U. Wenner, the meeting of the

World Evangelical Alliance in New York in October, 1873, should have a place of historic interest. Never before had any church gathering in this country brought together such an assembly of religious leaders, both American and foreign. In view of the fact that most international religious conferences now have to be held in Europe, it is interesting to note that out of a membership of five hundred and sixteen at this great meeting seventy-five were from Great Britain, nine from France, twelve from Germany, six from Switzerland, two each from Belgium, Spain and Turkey, Holland, Italy, Greece and Prussia. From branches of the Alliance in the British Provinces of North America, there were fifty-six and from the United States Alliance and its branches two hundred and ninety-four delegates. With the presence of many missionaries from the Near East and the Far East and South Africa, this may be regarded as perhaps the greatest ecumenical council of modern times up to that date. It created a tremendous impression, not only in New York City, but throughout the country. And again, the quality of these gatherings may be indicated by the names of some of those participating in this meeting: Charles Hodge of Princeton, Noah Porter and George P. Fisher of Yale, William F. Warren of Boston, Roswell D. Hitchcock of Union Theological Seminary, Richard Salter Storrs, Alva Hovey of Newton, Hon. J. L. M. Curry of Richmond, James McCosh of Princeton, and the presiding officer of the conference, Theodore D. Woolsey of Yale.

There were equally outstanding members from abroad, including Theodor Christlieb and Joseph Parker, the latter of whom, with Henry Ward Beecher, spoke on "England and America."

The World Evangelical Alliance met again at Basle, Switzerland, in 1879, and the United States branches met also in 1879 at St. Louis. Great meetings were held in connection with the Centennial Exposition at Philadelphia in 1876 and

Martin Luther's fourth centenary was celebrated in October, 1883. As the successor of William E. Dodge, the Hon. John Jay was elected president of the United States Alliance in 1883. The secretaryship was a voluntary office and we find Iraeneus Prime and Philip Schaff acting as corresponding secretaries, and the now venerable George U. Wenner, Lutheran, as the recording secretary, an office which he retained during the entire active life of the United States branch. Other outstanding names appear from time to time in the history of the meetings of the Alliance, such as Gen. Clinton B. Fisk, Cornelius Vanderbilt, William M. Taylor of the Broadway Tabernacle, Phillips Brooks of Boston, John Hall of New York, Moses Hoge of Richmond and Bishop Matthew Simpson.

The organization in the United States developed to such proportions as to call for a general secretary who should give his entire time to it, and in 1886 Josiah Strong, who had just come to national reputation through his great volume, "Our Country," was elected to this position. This marked the widening of the scope of the Evangelical Alliance to include social service in its definition of the title evangelical. One who reads Dr. Strong's utterances of that day discovers that he was a prophet, not only of his own time, but one whose prophecies and warnings are valid for our own age.

In 1887 "all evangelical Christians in the United States" were called to a meeting in the city of Washington to study the following questions:

"1. What are the present perils and opportunities of the Christian church and of the country?

"2. Can any of them be met best by hearty coöperation of all evangelical Christians which, without detriment to any denominational interests will serve the welfare of the whole church?

"3. What are the best means to secure such coöperation and to awaken the whole church to its responsibility?"

In 1889 the general conference was held in Boston, including such personalities as Bishop Greer of New York, James M. Buckley and Graham Taylor. At the Boston meeting about five hundred delegates came from sixteen denominations and from every section of the United States. The United States Branch sent delegates to the World Evangelical Alliance in Florence, Italy, in 1891, including such outstanding representatives as George Dana Boardman and Charles A. Stoddard.

It should be noted that Dr. Strong's utterances during this time constantly prophesied a coming together of the churches themselves, and in 1892 the great World's Conference was held in Chicago to consider the religious condition of Protestant Christendom, Christian union and coöperation, Christian liberty and the church and social problems, the latter taking a larger place than ever before in these world gatherings. At this meeting President McCosh of Princeton spoke on "The Federation of the Churches," and President Hyde of Bowdoin told the story of the Interdenominational Commission of Maine, the first approach toward a state federation of churches.

It is of interest to note the proposals and activities of the Evangelical Alliance which have been paralleled by the Federal Council. Preceding the organization of the New York City Federation of Churches by six years, a conference was held (1888) in Chickering Hall, which included the Alliance and several denominational mission societies, to consider religious conditions in the city, which led to a coöperative family-to-family visitation. It was the emergence of a spirit of social responsibility calling for coöperation. In 1890, the field secretary of the National Alliance, Frank Russell, reported the holding of one hundred and thirty-eight meetings in fifty-two cities, in thirteen states, involving travel of eighteen thousand miles.

Later on in this volume, as we record the growth of international church relations, we may well recall the exchange of messengers between the old and new worlds, some of them, as in more recent times, in connection with European war problems, which took place at this time, in which Philip Schaff occupied an influential relationship. One is also reminded of the historic visit of Henry Ward Beecher to England, during our Civil War. Dr. Russell, in 1891, attended the Alliance meeting in Florence, Italy, and in the same year visited forty-eight cities in eleven states, covering about thirty thousand miles during that year.

We now approach the transition from the Evangelical Alliance, a unified body of individual Christians, to the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and the unification of the churches themselves. In 1894 both William E. Dodge and Josiah Strong participated in the organization of the Open and Institutional Church League, a federation of churches of the type indicated by its name.

The World Evangelical Alliance held a jubilee meeting in London in 1896, and in 1897 the Alliance was active in advancing efforts to secure permanent provision for arbitration between Great Britain and the United States, thus prophesying a service in which, later, the Federal Council has come to have so large an interest.

At this point a word should be said regarding the separation of Dr. Strong from the administration of the Alliance. He was ahead of his age and probably outdistanced the thinking of many of his associates in the Alliance. In any event, the feeling was expressed that his plans for civic and religious betterment might be carried out better in some other way than through the Evangelical Alliance, with its chartered objects and its traditions. Dr. Strong therefore resigned in 1898 and a new organization was formed known as the Institute for Social Service, of which he became president and through which he rendered service during the remaining years of his valuable life. He also served from 1912 to 1916 as the chairman of the Federal Council's Commission on the Church and Social Service, a body which undertook a task for which the earlier Evangelical Alliance was not ready.

From this point on the Evangelical Alliance began to recede, its services being undertaken by other bodies and although it now maintains a technically legal existence, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America is regarded as its successor. There were several causes for its recession, among them perhaps the failure to evaluate the social outlook of Josiah Strong. On the whole, however, it may be said that the chief reason was that it had itself opened up the way for the churches to something larger. Dr. Strong's successor, Leander T. Chamberlain, in 1900, expressed gratitude that the Alliance had been an inspiring influence to the movement for federation.

Other Voluntary Movements

Meanwhile other bodies had been arising and developing, all manifesting the spirit of unity. The Young Men's Christian Association, followed by the Young Women's Christian Association, revival and laymen's movements, student organizations and conferences, especially in the interest of foreign missions, missionary and young people's bodies, became expressions of the search and prepared the way for more official unity. The several organizations referred to in an earlier chapter all came into being during the nineteenth century or the beginning of the twentieth, together with other similar occasional and auxiliary bodies such as the Laymen's Missionary and the Missionary Education Movements.

In a less organized form interdenominationalism was increasing in other directions, in the establishment of interdenominational religious journals and in the broadening of the theological seminaries, often by detachment from denominational bodies. The movement for unity was also the result of and part of the modern educational advance of the time, including a broader and more spiritual study of the Scriptures. While it is difficult to trace these influences there were at times schools of the philosophy of religion and theology which were not without influence in the progress of the age, and undoubtedly religious and social psychology had the same effect. Moreover, during the earlier period which is covered in this chapter, one particular denomination was organized, refusing, however, to be called a denomination and instituted for the very purpose of creating and establishing Christian unity, namely, the Disciples of Christ.

Meanwhile, the Sunday School movement, to which we have referred as one of the earliest precursors of unity, resulted in the organization of the World's Sunday School Association in 1889, and, almost simultaneously with this, in 1888 a somewhat general foreign mission conference was held in London. The latter may be regarded as the beginning of a world movement which culminated in the Edinburgh Conference of 1910.

In the United States, toward the latter part of the fourth quarter of the nineteenth century, a new type of local church had appeared known as the institutional church, largely associated, among others, with the names of Edward Judson, Charles A. Dickinson and Graham Taylor. Dr. Elias B. Sanford early saw the significance of these churches for a new approach to interdenominational fellowship, and under his inspiration the "Open and Institutional Church League" was organized in 1894 in the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church in New York. This really marked a step in advance in that it brought churches as such together rather than simply uniting individual Christians as the previous movements had done. This gathering bears record of other outstanding names such as Charles L. Thompson, Frank Mason North, John L. Scudder, Josiah Strong, Frank Russell, John Bancroft Devins, Washington Gladden and also included outstanding laymen such as William E. Dodge and John S. Huyler. This organization, under the editorship of Dr. Sanford, published a magazine known as "The Open Church." Several conferences, more or less national in character, were held and constituted a brief but significant stage in the movement for unity.

Meanwhile, in local communities federations of churches were formed, partly through the influence of the earlier local organizations of Bible societies, the earliest being the Federation of Churches and Christian Workers of New York City in 1895.[8] The East-Side Federation, initiated by John B. Devins in a particularly needy section of New York was an active body at about the same time.

The Open and Institutional Church League promoted and was the basis of the succeeding National Federation of Churches and Christian Workers, organized again largely under the inspiration of Dr. Sanford. A conference looking toward such a body was held in New York in 1900 whose permanent chairman again was William E. Dodge. This meeting appointed a national committee on federation of churches which included Hon. Charles E. Hughes, William Hayes Ward, Frank Mason North, Charles L. Thompson, John H. Converse and J. Cleveland Cady. The consultations of this committee resulted in the organization of the National Federation of Churches and Christian Workers in Philadelphia in 1901, with J. C. Cady as president, E. B. Sanford as secretary and Alfred R. Kimball as treasurer, a position which the latter held in this and the succeeding federated bodies until his death in 1930. Meanwhile the federation movement had what appeared to be promising development in local areas

[8] Long under the pioneer executive secretaryship of Walter Laidlaw.

and several local bodies were formed, some of which have maintained existence until this time.

The organization meeting of the National Federation of Churches and Christian Workers included delegates or members from similar local bodies in areas of New York State, in New York City, Hartford, New Haven, Jersey City, Syracuse, Pittsburgh and Cleveland, the Interdenominational Commission of Maine, the Connecticut Bible Society, the Evangelical Alliance branches of Pennsylvania, Boston and Philadelphia. It will be noted that the gradual approach toward the unity of the churches was manifested again in that while the members of this body were not denominationally representative they did represent local churches in large measure. In this body appear new and outstanding personalities, including Hon. Benjamin Odell, Rt. Rev. Ethelbert Talbot and Bishop John H. Vincent. Following this meeting several new local federations of churches were organized, including some which have disappeared and others which still exist. The second meeting of the National Federation was held in Washington in 1902, and to the representatives at this gathering President Theodore Roosevelt observed that "there are plenty of targets that we need to hit without firing into each other."

Dr. Sanford at this meeting expressed the hope that a committee might be appointed to secure the appointment of delegates from the denominational bodies themselves to meet in 1905 and thus the first direct step was taken which ultimately resulted in the organization of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. A crucial question had been whether or not the proposed conference should be wholly of delegates from national church bodies. The decision that it should be thus official, marked a new and important advance. It meant that the prophetic spirit of individual leaders had captured the corporate consciousness of the church itself.

A GRADUAL GROWTH

It will be observed that from the very beginning the movement toward federal unity has advanced step by step, ever enlarging its areas and constantly drawing closer and closer toward the integration of the church bodies themselves. Amid diversity there was the constant approach to unity. The early leadership was by prophetic individuals and groups induced by practical objectives to meet the demands of human life. There were no preconceived plans for ultimate organization. It was above all a living movement under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

Thus gradually the several denominations in the United States have advanced toward unity, stage by stage. In the very early days they had been in more or less opposition to one another. This was followed by the spirit of indifference and isolation, and still later by that of toleration when each was willing to respect the other's views. Gradually this spirit of toleration enlarged to unity in spirit and now we have reached the stage of coöperation in service in the path of federal unity.

This period of what we may term preparation was characterized by its simplicity of thinking and its practicality in action. There was a growing sense of freedom, an absence of abstract reasoning, much practice in prayer. These men accepted and assumed each other's faith in the fundamental verities of the gospel and one another's experience of life in Christ. Theories were being formulated, determined and validated out of practice rather than by argumentative discussion of theory. In some ways at least this epoch was not unlike the early church in its artlessness and naturalness.

CHAPTER IV

THE PROGRESS OF UNITY IN THE UNITED STATES

In the previous chapter we have noted how the impulsions toward unity have gradually overcome the difficulties inherent in the situation until finally the movement took the form of bringing the denominational bodies together. The earlier voluntary organizations had been representative of certain agencies of the churches, or, like the Young Men's Christian Association and the Young Women's Christian Association, had been organized for special tasks with particular and limited constituencies. These early movements were, however, of great significance. The older hostilities between churches faded away gradually. One church no longer rejoiced over the securing of members from another. Fraternity developed into fellowship and the spirit of unity became pervasive. Men and women hitherto more or less indifferent to the churches were enlisted in religious work. These institutions led on to higher hopes and larger promise. Their inadequacy, however, so far as real Christian unity was concerned, came to be recognized by their leaders. Those who now feel that federation will preclude closer union should learn a lesson from this experience.

Early Foreign Missions

We now need to retrace our steps somewhat and follow another path, in order to indicate the first direct approach to the church bodies themselves which fulfilled the confident prophecy of Richard Baxter and came from the foreign missions field. We have already called attention to an early conference of foreign mission boards in London which at least looked in this direction. Conferences in both the field and at home go back as far as 1854. In 1872 a missionary conference in Yokohama, Japan, was held to arrange a translation of the Bible, and later on at Osaka in 1881 and at Tokyo in 1900, as well as in other foreign mission centers, including India and China, conferences on Christian coöperation had their reflex action on the boards at home, while union churches were being established in the field.

In the early part of the nineteenth century there was coöperation between the Presbyterian Church and the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions of the Congregational Churches, together with the Reformed Church in America and the Associate Reformed Church, so that for a time the American Board was an interdenominational body and was instrumental in the inception of the United Foreign Missionary Society in 1817.

But we need to go farther back than this. Foreign missions began as a union movement at the famous Haystack meeting at Williams College in 1806, eventuating in the organization of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions in 1810. Its international associations began early when young Adoniram Judson, in 1811, went to meet the London Missionary Society to consider mutual relations between the foreign mission bodies of the two nations.

Indeed, interesting parallels suggest themselves. Foreign missions began in a revival of religion, following an age of religious indifference and neglect. We may well hope that, following the religious apathy of our own day, there may come a spiritual awakening which will advance our Christian unity. Again, however, there was the backward cycle. At first the Presbyterian churches adopted the American Board as their agency, as did also the Reformed Church in America and the Associate Reformed Church, so that for a time the American Board promised unity in this field. In 1826 the United Foreign Missionary Society merged with the American Board. But, due perhaps to conditions which could not then be overcome, the organizational consciousness prevailed and foreign missions were denominational until the latter part of the century. Nevertheless, comity and coöperation may be said to have been born in this earlier period.

It is also of interest to note that the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions and the Interseminary Missionary Alliance antedated the Foreign Missions Conference of North America by six years, being organized on the initiative of college students themselves. This is another illustration of the way in which individual and specialized groups have been the means of bringing the churches together. This student movement rapidly spread to other nations throughout the world.

The Conference of Foreign Mission Boards in New York in 1893 may be said to mark the most official approach toward an inclusive unity of organized church bodies. The pressure felt at home came constantly and increasingly from the field itself, its missionaries and new converts. Indeed, we are reminded that in some areas of the foreign field unity has in our time become a deeper reality than that at home, including bodies which here are more backward and aloof, in large measure due to the fact that old traditional divisions do not have to be overcome among simple and more childlike spirits; hence the movement in the mission fields for national and autonomous churches, which, wisely guided, is a step toward inevitable unity. Later the Laymen's Missionary Movement greatly furthered coöperative and federative progress. The Edinburgh Conference in 1910 was the most inclusive approach toward international unity by the church as such, although the London Missionary Conference in 1888 may be regarded as its precursor and earlier conferences in Asia had been international.

EARLY APPROACHES TO CHURCH FEDERATION

Doubtless the chief reason why the earlier advances toward unity had been confined to unofficial groups of individuals was the assumption that institutional Christian unity, or church unity, implied an identical confession of theological belief or mode of worship, or a common theory of the church's ministry and ordinances. Therefore for a considerable time it seldom occurred to these earlier prophets that anything more than these personal or group relationships was possible.

There were, however, far-visioned souls in the earlier days whose prophecies anticipated what has been realized. We have already referred to Samuel Schmucker, who in 1838 and again in 1870 proposed an elaborate plan for a council of evangelical denominations. While he included a somewhat elaborate creedal basis, for the most part it may be said that he anticipated the Federal Council. He was born out of due time and did not live to see his ideals realized. Attention should also be called to the fact that, while the Evangelical Alliance had been a body of Christians rather than a body of churches, nevertheless some of the denominations in the United States had recognized and approved it and had elected members to its conferences. Dr. Schmucker proposed to transform the World's Evangelical Alliance into a body *"representing* the Church Universal." In his recommendations for the American section of this Church Universal he provided that it should be "interdenominational and its delegated members be elected by and from each of the confederated denominations." It was proposed that "the business of this (American) Alliance shall be to discuss the various interests of the Redeemer's Kingdom in the nation and throughout the world;

and to propose and execute, both by its own agencies and through the coöperation of the judicatories of the different constituent denominational branches, all such measures as are recommended by the World's Alliance and as they themselves shall regard conducive to the progress of the Church of Christ." Dr. Schmucker also provided for other branches, including local and voluntary, which should be auxiliary to the national alliance. "The American primary branches are the existing highest ecclesiastical bodies of the several associated denominations, each acting according to its own rules and organization."

Dr. Schmucker's proposed constitution not only prophesied the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and the local federations of churches, but also the Universal Christian Council on Life and Work, which was instituted at Stockholm in 1925, but he would have accorded a measure of authority to both these bodies which has not been, at least as yet, realized. As we have noted, it is significant that this prophecy and the practical provision for it should have come from an outstanding representative of the Lutheran Church.

Gradually, therefore, a new idea had appeared which, without regard to exactness of definition, we will term federal unity. As revealed in the Open and Institutional Church League and the National Federation of Churches and Christian Workers, it came from men who were wrestling with the practical tasks of the churches in what was becoming a hostile or increasingly unaccommodating social order. Although at the beginning these leaders were still governed by the assumption that creedal uniformity was essential to any movement on the part of religious denominations as a whole, this new conception of unity was finding its way, and in 1904 a little group of prophetic administrators came together to see if they might unite on some simple basis of a common faith in Jesus Christ to do his work in the world together.

THE GENESIS OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL

As the result of three years of patient labor on the part of the committee appointed by the National Federation of Churches and Christian Workers, the first occasion when the denominations themselves came together was to consider this new and very simple conception of Christian unity in 1905 in Carnegie Hall, New York. New and honored names appear in the Committee on Correspondence which prepared for the Interchurch Conference, including William I. Haven, William H. Roberts and Rivington D. Lord. The Chairman of the Committee was William Hayes Ward, and the Chairman of the Committee of Arrangements and the Chairman of the Conference was Dr. Roberts. During the intervening period between 1902 and 1905 Dr. Sanford went to various parts of the nation arousing deep interest and arranging for the organization of several state and local federations. Meanwhile the National Federation of Churches continued its work, and, with E. Tallmadge Root as field secretary, the Federations of Churches in Rhode Island and Massachusetts were organized, as well as several others, some of which, however, have since lapsed. That the spirit of federation was becoming country-wide was indicated by the vigor of the Wisconsin state body. Dr. Sanford, always alert and skilful in finding men to support him, especially among the laymen, had the help during this period of Meletiah E. Dwight who, Dr. Sanford says, was his secretarial associate in everything but name.

The labors of the Committee on Correspondence and the Committee of Arrangements, by their conferences with the denominational assemblies and other national bodies, brought together at Carnegie Hall November 15, 1905, the most officially representative gathering of the Protestant forces of the United States up to that time. Among the new names that appear in connection with this gathering are those of Woodrow Wilson of Princeton University, Samuel J. Niccolls, Charles L. Thompson, Hon. David J. Brewer, Rufus W. Miller, Lemuel C. Barnes, Albert G. Lawson, William F. McDowell, Hon. Henry Wade Rogers, William J. Tucker and other outstanding personalities too numerous for mention.

The three succeeding years were again spent by the *ad interim* Executive Committee, under the chairmanship of William H. Roberts, in presenting the new plan of federation to the denominational bodies, securing their action upon it and their election of members to the final organization of the Federal Council. At the same time the Executive Committee took up important questions, including conditions of peonage in the Congo State, which they did in association with other Christian bodies from other lands. The painstaking care and the unselfish service of the builders of the new body should be observed.[1] The Preamble and Plan of Federation had been carefully prepared before the Interchurch Conference in 1905. There it was considered at length and referred to the denominational bodies. It was no slight task to explain it to them, but it was faithfully done. The requisite number having approved it, the Federal Council was *ipso facto* established, so that it really came into being before 1908 and met as such at Philadelphia in December of that year.

This is all of more than casual importance. It reveals the distinction between the voluntary and the more substantial organic way of accomplishing great ends. Still more, it gives significance to the church as a body representative of Christ and his mission. It illustrates the ideal of the church held by the men who instituted the Council and the genius and spirit which has characterized it throughout its history, often in shunning the quicker and easier way, with preference for that which promises permanency as well as progress.

---

[1] While this was the united work of several minds and hearts, the writer's affection for Dr. Sanford, dating back to his own student days, leads him to record Dr. Sanford's unselfish toil, over a long period of years in these succeeding movements, day in and day out, with an inextinguishable faith. He passed away in June, 1932.

As a result, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America met in Philadelphia in December, 1908. Its constitutional preamble, quite in marked contrast to the original elaborate proposals of Samuel Schmucker, was a masterpiece of artlessness, and consequently of inclusiveness. Simplicity is often the mark of spiritual guidance. The preamble and plan of federation were as follows:

"PREAMBLE

"WHEREAS, In the providence of God, the time has come when it seems fitting more fully to manifest the essential oneness of the Christian Churches of America in Jesus Christ as their Divine Lord and Saviour, and to promote the spirit of fellowship, service, and coöperation among them, the delegates to the Interchurch Conference on Federation, assembled in New York City, do hereby recommend the following Plan of Federation to the Christian bodies represented in this Conference for their approval.

"PLAN OF FEDERATION

"For the prosecution of work that can be better done in union than in separation a Council is hereby established whose name shall be the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

"The object of this Federal Council shall be:

I. To express the fellowship and catholic unity of the Christian Church.
II. To bring the Christian bodies of America into united service for Christ and the world.
III. To encourage devotional fellowship and mutual counsel concerning the spiritual life and religious activities of the churches.
IV. To secure a larger combined influence for the churches of Christ in all matters affecting the moral and social condition of the people, so as to promote the application of the law of Christ in every relation of human life.

V. To assist in the organization of local branches of the Federal Council to promote its aims in their communities.

"This Federal Council shall have no authority over the constituent bodies adhering to it; but its province shall be limited to the expression of its counsel and the recommending of a course of action in matters of common interest to the churches, local councils, and individual Christians.

"It has no authority to draw up a common creed or form of government or of worship, or in any way to limit the full autonomy of the Christian bodies adhering to it."

This almost totally new conception of unity had come to expression without very much antithetical discussion, and with general assent upon the part of thirty Christian denominations. Indeed, this was not the creation of unity; but rather the discovery that it existed potentially and was the culmination of the spirit that had been developing among great leaders for nearly a century. Unlike more recent efforts for complete union at one stroke, it was a gradual growth.

THE HOME MISSIONS COUNCIL

We have called attention to the previous interdenominational conference of foreign missionary boards and societies in New York in 1893 and the resulting organization of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America. Meanwhile, like their brethren in the foreign field, the workers engaged in home missions had found themselves facing bewildering difficulties in their social order. The economic and social forces in the cities, in rural districts and on new frontiers were too much for them. In the earliest survey by the Federal Council in the home mission field, for example, one hundred and thirty-three communities were found without Protestant churches of any kind, and four hundred and twenty-eight towns large enough to have postoffices without any churches at all. On the other hand, many towns with only three hundred or four hundred people in the same state were found with three or four churches, all sustained by mission funds. The Home Missions Boards under the influence of the Interchurch Conference of 1905, adopted the principle of federal unity and the Home Missions Council also came into being, shortly previous to the completion of the Federal Council, in 1908. Thus, under the general form of federation, there developed the subsidiary process which we may call administrative unity, in which practically all boards of the constituent denominations of the Federal Council and some other bodies are now consulting and working together either in autonomous organizations or as commissions of the Federal Council.

The Home Missions Council, organized on the wave of rising spiritual appreciation of an essential unity among Christians, brought into one national organization the agencies of the denominations to which, in their separate capacities, had been entrusted church distribution and money-spending activities in missionary service, within the limits of America and its insular dependencies. The Home Missions Council became, therefore, a practical expression, on a national scale, of comity and coöperation. Centralized understanding and planning, in annual and other conferences, and joint action through committees and officials, gave form and substance to the common mind and the common service of the churches, to Indians, Negroes, Mormons, immigrants, out unto Alaska, the Hawaiian Islands, Porto Rico and Cuba, and unto the changing conditions in industrial, urban and rural communities. The whole story of endeavor and achievement, expressive of these united forces and resources, through almost a quarter of a century, merits a longer recital than is here permissible.

And yet the spiritual functions and influences of essential unity were even more regnant in, and through, the less concrete, yet the more central experiences of the national bodies of the separate churches and denominations, as they themselves were more comprehensive and inclusive of denominational convictions and aspirations than were any, or all, of the distinct agencies through which these churches and denominations worked. The most clear-cut and definite experiences of Christian unity, as something more than fellowship, or comity, or coöperation, have issued from a community of ideas and ideals discovered in, and by these larger bodies themselves. The hope, therefore, of the future, so far as the past may point it out, seems to lie in the continued and much more intimate thought, understanding and sympathy of these same central bodies. Assured conclusions have gradually taken shape in the minds of those most closely associated with the practical workings and development of what may at length be called "The Interdenominational Mind" or, "The Interchurch Consciousness."

In this chapter we shall now follow mainly the development of the Federal Council, first because it represents the church bodies as a whole; second, because it is the body on which the federal movement so considerably depends and by which it is so largely determined; and third because it is likely to have influence as a unifying factor of similar and associated bodies, and also in helping to determine the course of the larger movement for Christian unity, including its more organic conceptions. The other bodies representing the boards of the churches are all formed on much the same pattern and will be considered in a later chapter describing the areas of service occupied by federated forces.

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF FEDERAL UNITY

The theory of federal unity received immediate acceptance upon the part of the churches, but its practicability was not so certain. On the one hand, there were those who expected it to transform church and society overnight, and many of them soon fell away when they were disillusioned. On the other hand, there were those, represented by one great Congregational leader, who, in a conversation with the author in 1908, gave it two years to live and said that that was much too long to hope for. As a matter of fact, the group of men who were really devoted to the hard task of putting federal unity into effect was very small in number. The denominational bodies gave the movement their blessing but practically no resources, and for about ten years, while there was reasonable and, under the circumstances, remarkable organizational growth and activity, the Federal Council was primarily a new state of mind in process of creation. Some of the best minds of the churches were engaged in coöperative or united thinking together, but in practice they were obliged to experiment and feel their way, gaining by the slow process of experience. The Federal Council is what is termed an "imponderable." Its influence cannot be tabulated in statistical and promotional form.

Its early progress was therefore frankly and consciously opportunistic. It followed very frequently the line of least resistance. It should be noted, however, that very often the line of least resistance is the line of greatest need and that opportunism does not always mean that nobody is doing any thinking. This occasionalness was revealed in the immediate occupation of those areas of Christian service which were new and on which the denominations had not become standardized. Here was the chance for leadership and change of method not so easily obtained in areas institutionally more fixed and determined. Thus the outstanding feature of the new body in 1908, which has come to be known as the social creed of the churches, was the first coherent voice in a program of service as distinguished from a common confession of theology. Moreover, there was at the moment a wave of social passion. Graham Taylor, Walter Rauschenbusch, Washington Gladden and Josiah Strong were the prophets of the day and hour. A movement with this objective was timely and, while the Federal Council has since then continuously broadened its field, its social objective has never been and never should be lost sight of, for Christian unity and social redemption are largely synonymous, both in time and in interdependence.

But strength was gathered very slowly. It was not easy to find men who could divert themselves from their denominational responsibilities, or who were temperamentally calculated to become engineers of a new organism. There were times when the treasury was on the verge of bankruptcy. It was not easy to interest practical laymen in an organization which consisted mainly of a new state of mind. They wanted to see—things. Growth was therefore slow, but constant and steady.

THE WAR PERIOD

The Council had become fairly well organized when the war broke out in 1914, and we may divert ourselves at this point to remark that this was the beginning of international relations which, during and following the war, assumed large proportions and enabled the Federal Council to be a considerable factor in the development internationally of the movement for federal unity. Upon the entry of the United States into the conflict the eyes of the churches, in this hour of national calamity, turned toward their nationally inclusive body, and the service of the General War-time Commission of the Churches, under the chairmanship of Robert E. Speer constitutes an epoch of its own in the history of Christian unity. All at once arose new and inescapable tasks. Every other institution of the nation was unified. For forty or more denominations to work independently was out of the question, so that the hitherto isolated or indifferent bodies, the Episcopal, Lutheran and Southern Baptists, were united in the General War-time Commission. During this period new problems appeared opening avenues for future service. The creation of the denominational war commissions brought serious danger of divided counsel, consequent weakened influence, overlooking and overlapping, and the anomaly of separate approaches to the government and to the people of the nation. Coördination of these scattered forces was needed with the voluntary organizations such as the Young Men's Christian Association and the Young Women's Christian Association. To a certain extent consultation, and at times common action were essential with the Roman Catholic and Jewish bodies.

When the war was getting well under way two classes of critics arose, the one rebuking the churches for not being more effective in arousing a militant consciousness; the other uttering reproof for what was declared to be a Chauvinistic spirit. One was concerned for what is called the "morale" of the nation, the other believed that the mission of the church is to preach peace at all times. It may be said that the Federal Council sought a constructive and forward-looking *via media* between these extremes. Among the earliest objectives of the General War-time Commission was "to provide a body which would be prepared to deal in a spirit of coöperation with the new problems of reconstruction which may have to be faced after the war."

Indeed, it should be recalled that during 1914-1917 the Council constantly urged the spirit of brotherhood and sought in every possible way to bring influences to bear that would make for peace, often suffering from criticism for crying peace when there was no peace. While many representative pastors and some church assemblies made occasional pronouncements during the conflict which were far from Christian, the War-time (not "war"] Commission and the Federal Council were at all times at least restraining influences in the interest of both justice and peace.

Thus, in a sudden hour of national and world disaster, the Protestant churches were prepared for common service. The message[2] of the Council is worthy of record. It has been characterized by churchmen of a nation with which we were at war as a "Christian" document.

"Our Spirit and Purpose

"After long patience, and with a solemn sense of responsibility, the government of the United States has been forced to recognize that a state of war exists between this country and Germany, and the President has called upon all the people for their loyal support and their wholehearted allegiance. As American citizens, members of Christian Churches gathered in Federal Council, we are here to pledge both support and allegiance in unstinted measure.

"We are Christians as well as citizens. Upon us therefore rests a double responsibility. We owe it to our country to maintain intact and to transmit unimpaired to our descendants our heritage of freedom and democracy. Above and beyond this, we must be loyal to our divine Lord, who gave His life that the world might be redeemed, and whose loving purpose embraces every man and every nation.

"As citizens of a peace-loving nation, we abhor war. We have long striven to secure the judicial settlement of all international disputes. But since, in spite of every effort, war has come, we are grateful that the ends to which we are committed are such as we can approve. To vindicate the principles of righteousness and the inviolability of faith as between nation and nation; to safeguard the right of all the peoples, great and small alike, to live their life in freedom and peace; to resist and overcome the forces that would prevent the union of the nations in a commonwealth of free peoples conscious of unity in the pursuit of ideal ends—these are aims for which every one of us may lay down his all, even life itself.

"We enter the war without haste or passion, not for private or national gain, with no hatred or bitterness against those with whom we contend.

---

[2] "The Churches of Christ in Time of War," edited by Charles S. Macfarland. Miss. Ed. Movement, 1917.

"No man can foresee the issue of the struggle. It will call for all the strength and heroism of which the nation is capable. What now is the mission of the church in this hour of crisis and danger? It is to bring all that is done or planned in the nation's name to the test of the mind of Christ.

"That mind upon one point we do not all interpret alike. With sincere conviction some of us believe that it is forbidden the disciple of Christ to engage in war under any circumstances. Most of us believe that the love of all men which Christ enjoins demands that we defend with all the power given us the sacred rights of humanity. But we are all at one in loyalty to our country, and in steadfast and whole-hearted devotion to her service.

"As members of the church of Christ, the hour lays upon us special duties:

"To purge our own hearts clean of arrogance and selfishness;

"To steady and inspire the nation;

"To keep ever before the eyes of ourselves and of our allies the ends for which we fight;

"To hold our own nation true to its professed aims of justice, liberty, and brotherhood;

"To testify to our fellow-Christians in every land, most of all to those from whom for the time we are estranged, our consciousness of unbroken unity in Christ;

"To unite in the fellowship of service multitudes who love their enemies and are ready to join with them in rebuilding the waste places as soon as peace shall come;

"To be diligent in works of relief and mercy, not forgetting those ministries to the spirit to which, as Christians, we are specially committed;

"To keep alive the spirit of prayer, that in these times of strain and sorrow men may be sustained by the consciousness of the presence and power of God;

"To hearten those who go to the front, and to comfort their loved ones at home;

"To care for the welfare of our young men in the army and navy, that they may be fortified in character and made strong to resist temptation;

"To be vigilant against every attempt to arouse the spirit of

> vengeance and unjust suspicion toward those of foreign birth or sympathies;
>
> "To protect the rights of conscience against every attempt to invade them;
>
> "To maintain our Christian institutions and activities unimpaired, the observance of the Lord's Day and the study of the Holy Scriptures, that the soul of our nation may be nourished and renewed through the worship and service of Almighty God;
>
> "To guard the gains of education, and of social progress and economic freedom, won at so great a cost, and to make full use of the occasion to set them still further forward, even by and through the war;
>
> "To keep the open mind and the forward look, that the lessons learned in war may not be forgotten when comes that just and sacred peace for which we pray;
>
> "Above all, to call men everywhere to new obedience to the will of our Father God, who in Christ has given Himself in supreme self-sacrifice for the redemption of the world, and who invites us to share with Him His ministry of reconciliation.
>
> "To such service we would summon our fellow-Christians of every name. In this spirit we would dedicate ourselves and all that we have to the nation's cause. With this hope we would join hands with all men of goodwill of every land and race, to rebuild on this war-ridden and desolated earth the commonwealth of mankind, and to make of the kingdoms of the world the Kingdom of the Christ."

This period was one of distinct growth in the development of the federal principle of Christian unity. The lessons of the war were salutary. The individual churches discovered their weakness in the effort to maintain high standards of national character and, above all, their inability to preserve the spirit of human brotherhood. Many sermons and addresses by pastors were far from Christian. The inadequacy of their organization to express their essential unity became apparent. The sense of their unreadiness was at first dispiriting. Denominational groups became so self-conscious that, through the camp pastors, there was an effort to divide the army denominationally. This illustrated, to the churches, their unpreparedness.

On the other hand, they gained a new sense of their latent but inherent forces, even to such a degree that false hopes for the immediate future were aroused. Among the leaders of the churches this experience was of the highest value as a means of self-discovery.

The Federal Council and the General War-time Commission instituted by it soon made themselves felt impressively. Without these agencies the Christian churches would have made little impression on the nation, if not indeed a very unhappy one. Those Christian bodies which found it both necessary and possible to unite in service in time of war, may well raise the question as to why they may not do so in time of peace.

The Federal Council emerged from the war period as a vital and obviously permanent factor in the national consciousness. Many of the lessons learned might not have been heeded by the various bodies and agencies concerned except under such conditions of stress and strain, so that the period of the war and its experiences carried federal unity a definite stage farther. The Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook issued a series of volumes surveying the principles and possibilities of Christian unity, the state of religion as discovered among American men, the missionary outlook, industrial reconstruction and Christian education, all of which will bear continued study today.

Post-war Problems

But before long it appeared that it was somewhat dangerous to envisage great ideas and that it was a serious responsibility to create a new state of mind. Men easily forget that a thousand years are but as a day with the Lord and that his processes defy haste and require premeditation. Those responsible for the Federal Council did not run after every seeming opportunity upon the horizon. When some clear, new objective appeared, time was taken to prepare the way, to secure the means, to await the moment, to find the line of least resistance and to avoid marching ahead so fast as to leave too wide a space between leaders and followers. It had been a constant process of patient education. Steps had to be steady and measured. Proportions and dimensions had to be considered and estimated. Movements forward had to be halted for a time. Assimilation was not always immediate or easy. Special occasions required adjustment. Judgment was called for in adapting means to ends. There was at times considerable distance between more progressive spirits and those of hesitancy and caution. Account needed to be taken often of the fastest and the slowest and this applied to bodies and groups as well as to individuals. Perspective and balance must be maintained. The main thing was to be constructive with eyes on the future. The council became thus characterized by sobriety and its meetings have generally been wanting in the excitement and commotion so general in large denominational assemblies.

The result was that two classes of critics arose. On the one hand, were those who felt that the Council was going so fast that it was running away with the churches and becoming a superbody, while others complained because it moved too slowly; one well-known critic describing the Council as "a painted ship upon a painted ocean." A Baptist Committee came to tell the brethren that they were taking themselves a bit too seriously in leadership and the next day a Congregational Committee to see whether or not it was exercising influence enough to justify their contribution of three or four hundred dollars. The Council had before it an uncharted sea whose channels and currents were not known, whose soundings had to be taken often, but this much may be said for those early days—no major project ever yet undertaken by the Federal Council has failed, or been abandoned; it has never yet gone seriously off its course, nor been held long aground upon the surrounding sandbanks.

The war, however, did a great many strange things to the minds of men. On the one hand, it demonstrated the value and significance of our unity, but it also aroused a deepening denominational consciousness synchronizing with the deepening of the sense of nationalism. The after-period was a trying moment and it is not yet over. Those responsible for the guidance of this new venture had always studiously avoided getting into the hands of professionalized reformers, crusaders or promoters. But in the post-war period there was everywhere a tremendous urge for promotion. Things could be made to go; they must be made to go by modern methods. The keys to the Kingdom of Heaven were finance, promotion and publicity.

Thus the Interchurch World Movement arose, and it is so long a matter of past history that we may say frankly, it temporarily impaired and seriously endangered the whole movement for Christian unity. It was an effort to do at one stroke what the Federal Council was seeking by patient, slower, educational and evolutionary processes. It was "an artificial tie-up."[3] Its very conception necessitated or induced its evaluation in terms of money. It was characterized by excessive individualism and consequent irresponsibility. It lacked in soberness and steadiness. While professedly interdenominational, the interest of many of its leaders was the preferment of their denominational bodies in terms of budgets, so that it tended to intensify the very thing that it sought to overcome. A considerable number of the men and agencies which coöperated in this movement and underwrote its expenses did so hesitatingly and in some cases not without

[3] Lyman P. Powell in "The Human Touch." Putnam, 1925.

protest. But the dominant feeling on the part of these persons and agencies was that they could not take the responsibility of weakening a movement which might be, as was constantly hoped, a real blessing to the churches.

These were trying years for the men responsible for the Federal Council. Some of its own leaders even urged that it attach itself to or merge itself into the Interchurch World Movement. Denominational leaders expressed the judgment that it might well step aside. Here was something big, to be done at once, while the policy of the Federal Council would require time. The Administrative Committee of the Council decided that it should continue its steady course, maintain an attitude of sympathy toward the new venture, do nothing to hinder and be of help to it as occasion offered.

It may now be candidly said, however, that the leading spirits of the Federal Council's Administrative Committee felt that the movement was without sufficient foundation, that its policies were ill considered and that the fortunes of Christian unity could not be confided to its exclusive care. Indeed, the hope was expressed that ultimately its enthusiasms and its splendid personal forces might find their way into a more substantial body. It was a lesson in promotion and publicity as a substitute for education. It was replete with the infelicities of haste, attempting to unify sections of the church bodies without adequate relationship to them as a whole, bringing men and groups together with a contrariety of motives and understandings, and, above all, impairing the financial stability of the churches by highly speculative processes. It made significant contributions which were not lost, but it must be admitted that its chief value was in showing how these things could not be done.

At the same time it should be said that this movement made some positive and permanent endeavors and that certain of the tasks which it began have been continued through other agencies. Indeed, it is possible that, with more patience and premeditation, it might have constituted a real revival. Many of its ideals will have ultimate fulfillment. Its courageous approach to the evils of industrial life, illustrated by the inquiry and report on the Steel Industry, made a strong moral impression. Many avenues of coöperative service were opened up, of which the permanent agencies have taken advantage. The surveys which it initiated have been followed up and the principle of survey and research perpetuated. While frankly recognizing the errors of that period, one is moved to admiration for the personal ideals and consecration of many of the men who undertook so gigantic a task, even though their valor was perhaps not sufficiently supplemented by discretion.

The Interchurch World Movement came and went, and was followed by another mood and a different kind of demand for more haste. The so-called Philadelphia plan for what was to be termed "The United Churches of Christ in America" was a kind of federal union with provision for organic union, the latter to be taken by successive steps. The main difference between this proposal and the Federal Council was that a rather vague arbitral authority was to be given to it by its constituent bodies. While setting forth organic union as its goal, no indication was given as to its basis, little to show what the difference would be. The procedure of its two conferences was characterized by some haste, quite in contrast to the more patient methods by which the Federal Council had been organized and by which it had developed. It duplicated the Federal Council both in constitution and in potentiality and proposed nothing that may not be adapted to and encompassed by the Federal Council if and when the denominations are ready. It became clear that they were not yet ready, and, although the Continuation Committee of the Philadelphia Conference is still in existence, there is little likelihood of its reappearance except as a stimulating group. Its proposals, however, are all likely to reach fulfillment by other more accessible roads and methods.

Policies of the Federal Council

All through these trying periods and experiences, wending its way constantly among the various voluntary organizations which sometimes challenged its authority, the Federal Council has been characterized by its building upon solid foundations, by preserving an impregnable constitution, but by dealing with the social problems of today with a courage that has again and again been commandingly audacious. It has never flinched before the most vicious attacks of industrial reactionists; has seldom, if ever, turned away from a problem or an available opportunity; but has attempted to move with sufficient care and caution, persuasion and education, to carry enough of its constituency along with it to gain its ends, and during these twenty-four years there has seldom been an occasion of significance which had not been, first of all, the result of many weeks of coöperative thinking, and on which the decision has not been practically unanimous within the body representing the churches and directing the destinies of the Federal Council. It was self-evident that a body whose mission was to unite, must not, within itself, be divided, and it never has been. It has constantly strengthened its representative capacity by getting closer and closer to its constituent units. It has been a bit unconcerned about defining its authority, realizing that in any case it could claim or indeed exercise only as much authority as it could exert, and that this was based upon its moral power, the wisdom of its course, and its appeal to the common sense and conscience of mankind. It has sought to be prophetic and has assumed that it was expected to exercise leadership and not simply to await denominational initiative. Any other assumption would have been abortive. Most of its major actions have been ultimately taken likewise by its constituent bodies. Errors have been made, but they were due to human limitations and were not the fault of either organization or policy. Contrasted with denominational assemblies, which are often characterized by unreliability in action, the Federal Council Quadrennials have acted with premeditation. No schools or parties have ever divided them. While several denominations have little or no provision for action between plenary sessions, the Council's *ad interim* bodies are representatively constituted for continuous action.

THE PROBLEM OF CHURCH AND STATE

It has been noted that, from the early beginnings, social Christianity occupied a large place in the objective of federal unity. The Evangelical Alliance carried this at times into the international field. From the earliest days of the Federal Council, critics have appeared and the allegation has been made that this has violated the principle of separation of church and state, sometimes on the amazing hypothesis that all social interests are the exclusive responsibility of the state.

The federal movement, particularly as represented in the Federal Council, has been an attempt to apply the principles of the Gospel to human life, or, as the constitution of the Federal Council expressed it: "To secure a larger combined influence for the Churches of Christ in all matters affecting the moral and social condition of the people so as to promote the application of the law of Christ in every relation of human life."

The strange assumption of these critics is that the distinction between church and state means that they occupy two separate solar systems. It appears to be assumed that in human affairs a circle may be drawn around those in which the state has an interest and those in which the church is concerned. When, however, we consider these interests of mankind we are unable to discover any such distinction. In fact, there is scarcely any subject of human welfare which is not of equal concern to both church and state. The principle of institutional separation is the very consideration that makes it possible for the church to interest itself in those matters which are common to both.

Certain distinctions, however, are obvious. For example, it is probably conceded by most reasonable Christian men and women, and it is certainly a fundamental principle with the directing officials of the Federal Council, that church bodies have no business to attempt control in political administration or the election of candidates. There are, of course, Christian leaders who take exception to this, but the responsible authorities of the Federal Council believe it is a principle which should be unreservedly maintained.

An illustrating example is at hand. The Council has supported the cause of temperance and has urged the observance of the eighteenth amendment as the law of the nation. But it has not participated in political campaigns or lobbies. Instead of such procedure, it has pursued the path of education and persuasion.[4]

A report of the Council in 1925 says:

> "This situation presents an unprecedented challenge to the schools and the churches. Thus far the delinquency of the churches is perhaps even greater than that of the federal government. In former years temperance education was stressed as a part of the religious educational program. It was often of a decidedly inferior type, to be sure, but the importance of temperate living and self control was kept continually before our youth. With the passing of the prohibition laws the task of moral edu-

---

[4] Gaius Glenn Atkins, in his recent illuminating volume, "Religion in Our Times" (Round Table Press, 1932), discussing reform and crusading movements, does so rather kaleidoscopically and loses discrimination and perspective in classifying the Federal Council with several organizations in whose methods it has no share.

cation with reference to temperate living has been all but ignored. As a part of the study here reported a careful analysis was made of the materials of religious education now in use with respect to the training of children and youth in temperance and in the responsibilities of citizenship entailed by the prohibition laws. The results, which have been published elsewhere, were chiefly negative.[5] Even the rude awakening that the outbreak of lawlessness has brought seems to have registered more in mere protest, on the one hand, and in discouragement and dissatisfaction with prohibition, on the other, than in the perfectly obvious alternative of setting about the performance of an educational task for which no amount of social legislation can ever be a satisfactory substitute."

Later, at the annual meeting of the Executive Committee in Detroit in 1925, the actions taken included the following: "especially does the Federal Council urge upon the churches the necessity for a more adequate program of education on the moral issues involved in the liquor traffic. We strongly emphasize the need for a far greater attention to this problem in the church's program of religious education. In the last analysis, law depends for its support upon the public opinion which sustains it and the conscience of those who live under it." This statement goes on to set forth the limitations of legislation.

It is the personal judgment of the writer that had the church bodies given heed to this appeal instead of relying to so great an extent on the election of political candidates and upon legislators, the ultimate outcome of the situation might have been different. Attention is called to this incident, however, mainly to illustrate the Council's policy.[6] When it comes to questions of legislation the churches should confine themselves to stating those fundamental moral principles on which, in the light of the Gospel, such legislation should be based when it deals with moral and social affairs. The maintenance of a lobby and the practice of lobbying, by a church body, is more than questionable, in view of the grave misuse of this institution. Therefore the Federal Council has rested its influence upon the judgments which it publicly expresses on matters of moral concern. If one desires to make a study of those issues in which both church and state are concerned, he has only to ponder the statement of social ideals set forth in the last chapter of this book.

---

[5] "An Evaluation of Current Religious Education with Reference to the Problem of Prohibition," by Goodwin B. Watson. *Religious Education,* February, 1925, pp. 56-71.

[6] In this instance several church bodies relied largely upon detached agencies, over which they had no direct control. This question of policy is elsewhere referred to in this volume.

There are occasions, however, when a particular measure which is proposed may be so clearly based upon those moral principles as to make any distinction between a statement of principle and a statement of legislative practice impossible or fictitious. If, for example, the churches believe that judicial procedure should take the place of war, the most natural thing to do is to urge for adherence to an international court of justice. There can be no hard and fast rules governing this matter, and such decisions must be left to the ordinary guidance of common sense.

Ideally the church and the state should find ways of coöperating on all questions relating to human welfare.[7] In any event, it is evident that for the most part the Protestant churches have decided that while, on the one hand, the church must not seek to dominate the state, on the other hand, they have no desire for a state-controlled church. A study of the procedure of the Federal Council makes it clear that there can be expressions of judgment on the subjects of such legislation, for example, on the part of the churches, just like any other expressions of organized public opinion, which the very principle of separation of church and state makes it possible for them to express. It may be noted in this connection that a representative committee has been appointed by the Federal Council to make, in association with the Department of Research, a thoughtful survey and study of the whole question of church and state and their mutual relations. The report of progress at the Quadrennial meeting in December 1932, stated that the forthcoming volume of this study would cover the historical background, the range of present theory and practice, an analysis of representative ministerial and lay opinion, with a consensus of judgment. This is a much needed inquiry.

---

[7] Herbert Hoover, both before and since he became President, has almost always called the church bodies into conference over social questions.

In passing, it may be noted that there have been occasions when federated church bodies have taken vigorous exception to actions of the state which actions were intended for the protection of the churches. Any thoughtful study will reveal the fact that the Federal Council has been the major influence in both defining and observing the principle of separation and independence of church and state.

Reactionary groups have at times made violent attacks on the council for its social program and on one occasion, to meet these assaults, a group of far-visioned employers of labor came together and signed the following statement.[8]

"We have given careful consideration to the industrial policy of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and we are clear in the following conclusions:

"1. The present critical situation in industry requires for its relief a new spirit of goodwill and fair dealing, guided by Christian principles. The united influence of the churches is therefore needed and to be welcomed in the industrial field.

"2. The general policy of the Federal Council and its Social Service Commission has been and is such as will commend itself to employers who are seeking good relationships and goodwill in industry. There would be differences of opinion as to details, such as are incident to any serious undertaking.

"We note a concern for the worker and his family which we ought to expect of followers of Jesus, and also of progressive employers.

---

[8] The writer recalls an evening at the home of Robert J. Caldwell, when these outstanding industrial leaders, conferring far into the morning hours, prepared these conclusions.

"We commend especially the present plans for conferences in industrial centers between employers, employees, ministers and public officials. All that these plans require in order to be approved is to be understood. They are constructive, sound and of large potential value for industrial peace.

"3. The attacks made upon the Council and its officers in various journals are, in our judgment, either based upon misinformation, or unjust, misleading, often absurd and in many cases absolutely false statements. We believe that the employers who have accepted them have been seriously misled.

"4. We especially deplore any financial boycott of the church bodies as unethical and highly inexpedient. The United States needs the Church in these days; and the Church it needs is not one that is timid or colorless, but one that, while judicious, is aggressive and courageous."

At least three volumes have been issued by compensated propagandists, financed by interests actuated by the motives of the craftsmen of Ephesus (Acts xix), in the effort to intimidate the Council's constituency and to mislead the public, by the most unscrupulous falsities. The Federal Council has been unshaken in its course and such assaults have had no appreciable effect.

Federal Unity: State and Local

It is of interest to recall that Dr. Schmucker, early in the nineteenth century, called attention to the anomalous situation in towns and cities. Here were churches side by side, either more or less hostile or indifferent to one another, their several allegiances being to distant churches whose practical problems they shared but little. He observes that "no bond of outward union at all would be more conducive to brotherly love among neighbors than a bond which excludes those around us and unites us to others afar off."

It will also be recalled that the federated movement as such began in local communities. The earliest regional federation was the Interdenominational Commission of Maine in 1890 and the first city federation that of New York City, organized in 1895. Several state organizations antedated the completion of the Federal Council. Very few of them, however, were in active existence in 1908 when the Federal Council took finished form, and the local movement has practically been coincident with the national. The early National Federation of Churches and Christian Workers was based largely on representation by local church groups. Likewise the preamble of the Federal Council in 1908 referred to the organization of "local branches." The first administrative procedure undertaken in 1909 was the division of territory in the United States and the establishment of regional offices in the East, Middle West, and Far West to carry forward the organization of these so-called "local branches," the latter being a term which, in view of the nature of the constitution of the Federal Council, was, however, hardly an appropriate one. For a couple of years there was considerable activity in the organization of state and local federations, just as there had been for several years previous, but those responsible for the administration of the Federal Council soon discovered that very few of the communities were as yet ripe or ready for such organizations; that as a matter of fact no program could yet be prepared by the Federal Council for such bodies; that the national body itself must become stronger and better organized; and finally that the local development of the movement would require patient tilling of the soil, the sowing of seed and the cultivation of educational processes.

Meanwhile a considerable proportion of the state and local bodies which had been rather prematurely organized during the preceding decade or more had either disbanded or lapsed, so that in 1911 this work began anew and by a more patient and evolutionary method. This temporary failure was, in considerable measure, due to an effort to standardize local bodies. Communities greatly vary in their needs and also in the forces needed to meet them. Experience has shown that local federations must be allowed freedom as to their constituency, form of organization and program. Local communities may perhaps be said to be more or less temperamental. They differ widely because of different conditions, in industry, in social conditions and in the possession or lack of leading personalities. There is now an effort to take all these factors into account and to let them largely determine the form of organization, as well as its objectives.

The Men and Religion Movement, just at this earlier period, gave a new impetus to local federations. Several were organized and others reorganized, under the impulse of this movement and its personal leaders. It left a permanent impression in many cities and later on its leaders[9] became associated with the Federal Council.

It is gratifying to note that in these twenty years, however, the state and local federations and councils of churches have reached a point where they have been deemed worthy of a survey. The writer, having been familiar with the problems and difficulties of this aspect of federation, had hardly expected to see these bodies develop to any such point as they have, illustrated by the important volume prepared by H. Paul Douglass, "Protestant Cooperation in American Cities." Dr. Douglass finds the supporters of federation too much disposed to think of local councils of churches as symbols of unity rather than as effective working organisms, but he nevertheless regards this as a necessary factor in a young movement, and this phenomenon as vital. It is an expression of a religious homogeneity in cities which has only begun to find organized form, and which is confronted by an organizational complexity not easy to deal with. Interdenominational organizations have often increased denominational confusion, to which is added a multiplicity of agencies devoted to various reforms which cut across the churches. The church federation movement is an effort to bring system into a chaotic situation which has grown up, not only between but within denominations.

---

[9] Fred B. Smith and Roy B. Guild, who have rendered preëminent service in this field.

Dr. Douglass' conclusion that the present status of local federations is not adequate to the profound end they seek is obvious. In the judgment of the writer, the chief need, or one of the chief needs, is that of trained leadership, both voluntary and executive, and twenty years is a short time in which to develop such leadership. On the whole, considering the situation as it existed twenty years ago, there has been reasonable progress, but, as Dr. Douglass earnestly urges, the time has come for the religious agencies in our cities to take local federation more seriously. Perhaps a very immediate need is to discover the way by which the loyalties of financial support may flow adequately into the new channels of coöperative or united service.

The local movement should assume increased vitality through the present development of state organizations, including the State Home Missions Councils and those of the International Council of Religious Education and as the local agencies of the latter find the right relation to the state and regional federations of the churches.

There are now eight state federations of churches and about twenty state councils of home missions. There are about fifty city federations or councils of churches which are administratively organized. In addition there are ten state organizations under volunteer leadership and about one hundred city or town organizations which vary in name, type and effectiveness. There are also many state, county and other regional and city councils of religious education.

There is the customary Protestant diversity in these organizations, corresponding largely to local problems, needs and environment. It is to be hoped that closer relations between the Federal Council and such bodies as the Home Missions Councils and the International Council of Religious Education will bring about more coherency and flexible standardization. All these organizations, however, are manifestations of the spirit of unity and are gradually finding their way together.

THE COMMUNITY CHURCH MOVEMENT

About eighteen years ago the author called a meeting in his home to organize a church in a new community.[10] The next day, in the train, he was approached by a man of influence and usefulness, who, to his amazement, remarked, "I had hoped that this community might be without any church." When asked his reason for so unusual a wish, he replied, "We are a united community, in our neighborliness, our social interests and our moral ideals and indeed in our religious life. Now you begin to bring in churches to split us up." His observation will bear at least some reflection. The church in question, however, has since then had twenty denominations represented in its membership, with never the slightest suggestion of dispute or discussion.

It happens that this chapter is being written in a little village of the South. It has about three hundred white inhabitants. There are three Protestant churches, but only one resident pastor, who, however, preaches elsewhere on alternate Sundays. The churches hold services every other Sunday, and in one case every third Sunday. The congregations number twenty-five to forty. During about six months there is an added hotel population of three to five hundred who are almost untouched by the churches. The church property is run down, the pastors receive less than a living wage, each of them ministering to two parishes. There are multitudes of such communities and churches all over the United States. What is the remedy? Is the community church the answer?

---

[10] Mountain Lakes, N. J.

The community church movement has been going on simultaneously with the others that we have mentioned. It would be difficult to describe it as either federal or organic. It has both characteristics. For a good many years there have been so-called union churches, particularly in New England, and independent, i.e. non-denominational, churches have appeared from time to time in new settlements of the West and elsewhere.

Changes which were brought about just before the war in the social, cultural and economic conditions, especially in rural areas, tended to increase the need for merging churches and establishing them upon a community basis. Competition among Protestant churches had become so serious that a good many communities had literally closed their church doors. Large sums of home mission money had been expended in competitive situations. Religious impulses had escaped into secular community organizations. Economic conditions, the need for an enlarged social unit as the basis of organized religion, gave rise to the community church movement.

A community church may be described as one which seeks to unite peoples of several denominational backgrounds in one Christian fellowship.

Community churches are of three distinct types, the denominational, the independent or unaffiliated, and the federated. Approximately thirty-three and one-third per cent of the total number belong to each type.

The denominational community church is one in which the church has broadened the terms of membership to include all professing Christians of various names, giving these members in the community equal privileges of membership and stressing Christianity without making the members formal denominationalists, in a strict sense.

In other communities the independent or unaffiliated community church is connected with no one denomination and includes members from several denominations in the one community church membership.

The federated church is composed of two, three or more churches continuing their separate organizations, but organized under one constitution, having one minister, one service of worship and a community program. These churches still retain affiliation with each denomination heretofore represented.

The Community Church Workers of the U. S. A.[11] is an incorporated body and its constitution provides the following objects:

> "To foster Christian unity and promote community fellowship.
>
> "To help communities in the United States of America unite local churches into community or united churches.
>
> "To plan community programs; federate local churches; organize new unit churches; survey churches and communities and help them unite.
>
> "To hold conferences, cooperate with churches, councils of churches, and all other agencies the better to serve the spiritual and religious needs of America.
>
> "To foster and promote fellowship for community religion and the building of community good will through education, organization and demonstration.
>
> "To help reduce competition and overlapping of effort in religious organization and activity; to place cooperation above competition in the religious and philanthropic activities of the various communities in the United States.
>
> "And to do all things necessary or appropriate to the accomplishment of the foregoing purposes."

There are at present about two thousand community churches in the United States. Some of these are large city churches which are known under various names of community, united, union or federated churches. The state of

---

[11] Rev. Richard E. Shields, former pastor of the Community Church of Mountain Lakes, N. J., is the untiring executive secretary.

Ohio has the largest number, with Massachusetts and California next in order.

The following plan of coöperation has been adopted by the Community Church Workers of the U. S. A., the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and the Home Missions Council:

> "There shall be established a Joint Committee consisting of three members from each group. The function of this Committee shall be:
>
> "(a) To study—in coöperation with the five-year program of survey and adjustment of the Home Missions Council—the spiritual interests of individuals and communities of America with special reference to the question, How can the churches—present and future—so work together as to produce the best spiritual results without competition and overlapping of effort.
>
> "(b) To make such recommendations to local communities and to state and national ecclesiastical bodies as shall grow out of this study.
>
> "(c) To follow up such recommendations by whatever means may seem wise to realize the ideal of greater unity and effectiveness among the churches of America, recognizing first, last and all the time, the right of the community to determine the nature and form of the church, whether denominational or otherwise, which it will attend and support.
>
> "The Executive Secretary of the Community Church Workers shall cooperate in the following ways:
>
> "(a) In the five-year program of survey and adjustment.
>
> "(b) Participating in conferences and other educational programs.
>
> "(c) As corresponding secretary of the Joint Committee."

This Joint Committee recommended to the North American Home Missions Congress, meeting in Washington, D. C., December 1 to 5, 1930, the following principles in adjusting over-churched situations throughout the United States and these principles were approved.[12]

---

[12] A survey of community churches was made by Miss Elizabeth R. Hooker in 1928 for the Institute of Social and Religious Research under the title "United Churches."

"That in the making of church adjustments in communities of 1,000 or less, the following principles should be observed:

A. The primacy of the community interests and the rights and affections of the smaller groups as well as of the larger.

B. That the church should be so formed, and its affairs so conducted, that in all things local it will work toward a single church consciousness, while in its outside affiliations it shall observe such missionary objectives and fellowship interests as continue to enlist the affection of the membership.

C. That it shall show sacred regard for the ceremonies, customs, or sacraments through which the several groups have been wont to express themselves, making suitable arrangements for their continuance.

D. That its affiliations shall be such as, on the one hand, will not interfere with the development of a single church consciousness, and a new community ideal, and, on the other, will keep it in touch with the going order of Christendom and in harmony with those ideals and convictions which, through the generations, have become contributions of world-wide value."

In a country like our own where there are many new areas yet to be settled and developed, and where our cities are spreading out into distinctive suburban communities, and rural sections are losing population, we may look for the rapid growth of community churches, and in those areas where the population is diminishing we may also look for an increasing number of community churches of the federated type.

Another method is under experimentation at Radburn, N. J., adapted to new and developing communities without hard and fast organizational form, but leaving the religious interests of the growing community to be determined from time to time according to its needs. Just as in this new development the school system and other plans of community life were intelligently and unitedly conceived, so the five denominations which have become interested in the new community jointly engaged a minister to represent them all, and organized the

Radburn Council of Religion with an agreement that no one of them would erect a church edifice until this Council should decide the churches to be desired and their location.

There is a still further opportunity for community churches which has not yet been very extensively cultivated. In many communities there is still only one church of some one denomination. These might well be renamed and reconstituted. It can be done without disturbing the denominational connection if the church will but divest itself of those particular traits which really mean little or nothing to so many of its members. There is little doubt that in such cases a new community interest and loyalty would be awakened if it were felt that the church was for the sake of the community rather than for an eclectic group in it. Most of the major religious bodies today are broadly sympathetic enough to include such churches [13] and give them community freedom.

The significance of this movement is that here we have the people taking matters into their own hands independently of overhead bodies and their state and regional superintendents, if not at times in defiance of them. The first considerations are the needs, opportunities and possibilities of the community itself. The denominational bodies will do well to let this movement induce a more rapidly increasing coöperation between them. They can at least no longer ignore it.

---

[13] Dr. Lyman P. Powell, at St. Margaret's Church in a distinct community of the Bronx, New York City, has gone a long way in revealing the possibility of making a Protestant Episcopal church a house of prayer for all people.

CHAPTER V

THE PROGRESS OF UNITY IN THE UNITED STATES

ORGANIC UNION OF HOMOGENEOUS BODIES

WHILE later on this volume will treat the general question of organic union, the progress of unity in the United States includes the consideration of organic union between family and homogeneous groups of churches. Thus far, with the exception of the merger of two of the evangelical bodies, the Evangelical Church and the Evangelical Association, the union of the Baptist and Free Baptist bodies which was the earliest,[1] the merging of the Cumberland Presbyterian into the Presbyterian U. S. A., the formation of the United Lutheran Church and the union of the Congregational and Christian Churches, these movements have gone no farther than joint committees and conferences, of which there are several different proposed groupings. These are further referred to in another chapter which sets forth the attitudes of the denominations toward the general question of unity.[2]

THE GENIUS, SPIRIT AND GROWTH OF FEDERAL UNITY

In the introduction to this volume attention was called to the somewhat perplexing multiplicity of federated organizations and of other voluntary bodies associated with the churches and often approved by them. While we shall consider these in a later chapter, we may at this point note the present tendencies toward the federating of these federated bodies. Those representing the boards of the denominations and the voluntary bodies approved by the churches are now related to the Federal Council through corresponding membership on its Executive Committee and through their representative members in the departments of the Federal Council

---

[1] "Twenty Years After: The Story of Baptists and Free Baptists," by Alfred Williams Anthony.

[2] The problems of these attempts are illustrated in "A Working Conference on the Union of American Methodism." The Methodist Book Concern, 1916.

The Quadrennial meeting of the Council at Rochester in 1928 provided for a Committee on Function and Structure, composed of officially named representatives of the constituent denominations of the Council and including also members associated with the other federated bodies. This Committee has been considering, among other questions: (1) the closer integration of these federated bodies, and (2) the relationship between the Federal Council and its constituent denominations looking toward the possibility of an enlargement of the functions, if not of the authority, of the Federal Council.

It may be doubted whether any similar movement in history can be said to have made any such advance in a quarter of a century as that for federal unity, since the organization of the Federal Council in 1908. From the very beginning until today we have had here a constant organic growth, calling from time to time for adaptation and readaptation. The Council has been dynamic rather than static. For example, upon becoming its administrative secretary in 1911 the writer discovered that there was little real understanding, except by a few leaders, as to what the Council was or was to be and in 1913 he voiced his own understanding in a statement, which was approved by the Executive Committee, containing the following definitions:

"Its differentiation from other movements looking towards unity is that it brings together the denominations for union in service rather than in polity or doctrinal statement.

"The Federal Council is the sum of all its parts.

"It is not an unrelated organization. Its function has been to express the will of its constituent bodies and not legislate for them. Were this, however, to be construed as precluding the utterance of the voice of the churches upon matters in regard to which the consciousness and the conscience of Christianity are practically unanimous, the Federal Council would be shorn of the power given it by the constituent bodies when they adopted as one of its objects: 'To secure a larger combined influence for the churches of Christ in all matters affecting the moral and social condition of the people, so as to promote the application of the law of Christ in every relation of human life.'

"Denominational autonomy—In the original Plan of the Federation the autonomy of the constituent bodies is, however, wisely safeguarded. No action by the Federal Council, even though taken as all its important actions have been taken, by the unanimous vote of the officially constituted delegates of the constituent bodies, can, by the terms of its constitution, be legally imposed upon those constituent bodies. Such action, by the terms of the constitution, goes back to the constituent bodies in the form of a recommendation for their action or ratification, which may either be assumed or definitely expressed.

"It is, however, clearly the duty and the function of the Council to determine upon objects for such common action and to find appropriate expression of the consciousness and the conscience of the churches upon them.

"Functions of the Council—While the duties of the Council are thus, with these safeguards and limitations, to represent the churches upon important matters of common concern, and, in the senses above indicated, to exercise a genuine leadership which recognizes the whole body of its constituency, the Council may not consider itself primarily as an independent entity, but rather as a common ground upon which the constituent bodies through their official delegates come together for cooperation.

"Under this conception the Federal Council does not create new agencies to do the work of the churches, nor does it do the work of the denominations or the churches for them. Its policy is that of using the existing agencies, and this policy should be followed out with relation to the interdenominational movements which are recognized by the churches. In the main, however, these existing agencies are the constituent bodies themselves and their official boards and departments.

"It is, therefore, the function of the Council, not so much to do things as to get the denominational bodies and the interdenominational movements to do the work of the churches in cooperation. Here its function is not that of overseer and director, but that of an agency for the correlation and the co-ordination of existing forces and organizations, and, so far as it may be permitted, it is to recommend, give guidance, and point out the way.

"These same principles of policy apply to the various commissions appointed by the Council. They act always as agents of the Council and distinctly represent themselves as such. They also hold themselves as subject to the Executive Committee of the Council in accordance with the by-laws of the Council.

"Like the Council itself, these Commissions, in relation to the denominational agencies, regard themselves as the sum of all their parts.

"The Council thus seeks to find the will of the constituent bodies and their departments and to interpret and express it in common terms. The Council then aims to secure the doing of the will and conscience of the constituent bodies by common and united action.

"The cooperation implied in the fellowship of the Federal Council does not require any one of the constituent bodies to participate in such cooperative movements as may not be approved by it, or for which its methods of organization and work may not be adapted."

In the main these principles have been maintained. The attempt has been to retain both elasticity and coherency and to keep the way open for advance.

The men who instituted the Federal Council differed from some of those who have dealt with the problem of unity in terms of tradition and theory in that they were objective rather than subjective, being concerned with the human needs of the world; they conceived of the church as existing for the sake of humanity rather than as an end in itself. Without this reality of unity the church's vision would have been lost. These men were dealing with the overwhelming task and mission of the church rather than with its traditions and symbols. Thus they sought a working and workable unity and were primarily concerned with its object, the winning of the world to Christ, rather than with its institutionalism, with the spirit that giveth life rather than with the letter that killeth.

Nevertheless there has certainly not been discernible any loss of spiritual power, but rather its increase as, toiling together, men and women of differing types and tempers have come heart to heart and soul to soul, each strengthening the faith of the other. As the Chairman of the Executive Committee put it to the Quadrennial meeting in 1916:

> "These four years have brought to this fellowship of the great churches of America tests and discoveries. Closer contact has meant clearer focus—focus in which the unities and the diversities have equally been revealed. One knows little about friend or neighbor until one travels with him. Who shall affirm that intimacy has not deepened respect, that the sharing of experience has not melted away prejudice and given new warmth to sympathy? There are signs that self-knowledge has been promoted. More certainly than ever before there is a common understanding of what binds together and what holds apart the churches of Christ in America. Fellowship is revelation. We are more nearly sure in the mutual examination of our common Christianity as to the marks which look like seams in the fabric, but which are only flaws in the weaving. Our convictions do not lose their strength but increase their length. They reach as before to the men who have been our denominational saints, but, far beyond, to Him who is for us all the one Savior. We travel back upon the familiar road of our denominational history to the point where it diverged from some broader fellowship, but we do not rest there. Unerringly beyond these ecclesiastical forks in the road, past every branching route, joined at the intersections by groups with whom for decades, it may be for centuries, we have been sadly unfamiliar, we find our way to a place called Calvary and a hill called Olivet. We waive no right or privilege, we break with no sound tradition, we surrender no precious heritage, but we

become fixed in the persuasion that the church has but one inalienable right, the right of finding Christ in the world of today and interpreting him in all his sacrificial and triumphant power to that world. Perfect agreement in opinion, placid uniformity in expression and method do not appear. It is a waste of energy and time to seek for either. But in this fellowship we have seen the glory of sympathy break into the flame of enthusiasm when men of different cults and names have brushed aside tradition and prejudice and found the Christ in one another's hearts. It is not in what we each hold dear that we find our common ground, but in what we each hold most dear. It is not in their history, their traditions, their formulæ that the churches of Christ can be one; it is alone in the Christ himself.

"To those who in the period from 1894 to 1908 looked and worked toward such an organization as this Federal Council, that notable assembly in Philadelphia seemed a consummation.

"The ascent, however, to that summit brought them and the churches they represented not to a mountain peak but to a plateau. What to aspiration had seemed a height of vision, to achievement became the broad plain of opportunity. Through the intervening years, as atmosphere has cleared and action has developed energy, the horizons have lifted and the unbroken light has revealed at once the forces and the tasks of the churches of Christ. Brothers of the Council, it seems to your Executive Committee that the period of experiment is passed. Repair and complete the mechanism according to your best wisdom. But doubt not that this fellowship of great churches in America expresses in some large measure the mind of our common Lord; hesitate not to empower it, to direct it, that through it the divergent policies of the churches may be turned into converging and cooperating forces; that through it, perchance, some common program, large enough for the needs of a bewildered and broken-hearted world, may be revealed as the purpose of Him, who in all our wavering, our retreats, our advances, our victories, is head over all things, to the church, which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all."

These words were uttered by Frank Mason North, who in himself has united those spiritual impulses without which all human service is without full significance to humanity, together with the vision of the human mission of the church so searchingly revealed in his hymn "Where cross the crowded ways of life." The Council has thus, without any concern about authority over them, endeavored to help the churches to bring their united influence to bear upon the life and institutions of our time. For authority and the arbitrary exercise of it, the Council would substitute the exercise of moral and spiritual influences.

In attempting a résumé of this progress, let us note that the beginnings of the movement were entirely unlike the rise of our denominational bodies. It did not center upon a particular form of the intellectual expression of religious faith, although its early leaders were men of profound personal convictions. It was not concerned to unify ordinances, observances or methods of polity. While a few great personalities of unwonted faith and vision were largely responsible for its inception, it was not the marshaling of a host of disciples about some magnetic, persuasive or commanding figure. It did, however, bring out great men and minds and make them available for the church at large. Nor was it simply the coherence of an eclectic group; it was rather the expression of the inarticulate sense of a common need. It was not conceived by abstract mental processes but was based upon concrete and living experience and reality in service. Its doctrines have been learned by seeking to do the will of the Father. In its philosophy, it was an attempt to realize the divine principle which pervades all nature, of identity with diversity, of unity with freedom. The Federal Council was the result of compelling practical necessities, of new, imperative and enlarging spheres of useful service to mankind. It thus came into being through the coöperative thinking and leadership of men who were not simply dealing with the problems of the study and the midnight oil, but with the hard and rugged work of the Christian churches as they faced baffling tasks.

This volume will not attempt to personalize so far as the present generation of leaders is concerned. Mention has, however, been made of the pioneers. The present leadership of the federal movement is characterized by practical efficiency, and its more official selection by the ecclesiastical agencies insures its representativeness. The latter fact, however, tends occasionally to limit the prophetic element which marked the earlier epoch. "There were giants in the earth in those days." If ever, through ecclesiastical reaction, the Federal Council should lose the spirit of earlier days, there will surely arise new giants to begin over again. Fortunately, with occasional exceptions, the denominational bodies have thus far been wise in their selection of the Council's personnel. The Federal Council has rendered no slight service to the churches and to the nation by providing a platform for their spiritual and social leaders.[8]

In the formative period, it must be confessed, the Council largely consisted of a group of its leaders. Denominational officials to a large extent did little more than tolerate it, good-naturedly or otherwise. These leading spirits were left pretty much alone. This may be perhaps regarded as providential, for, had a large number of the ecclesiastical officials realized just what was developing and what it might lead to, it is quite possible that a restraining, if not a dead hand might have been imposed. By the time a real consciousness of its meaning came to some of the denominational authorities, it had gained its momentum, and was amenable to guidance but not to repression. Had its working elements been as close to the denominations then as they are now, one may well doubt whether it would have been much more than an annual or quadrennial gesture, for there is such a thing as denominational-mindedness. It should be added that the Federal Council has never in its history had any one leader, as that term is generally used. Its leadership has always been coalescent. In quadrennial sessions the denominational members have never been seated in blocs. Ecclesiastical politics have been absolutely unknown factors.

---

[8] Witness Presidents Robert E. Speer, S. Parkes Cadman, Francis J. McConnell, E. R. Hendrix, Shailer Mathews and Albert W. Beaven as mere examples among many.

The Federal Council thus, while expressing a widespread sense of need, did not take the form of a great popular uprising and was not born full-grown. Its development has been that of a simple and gradual process. It has not been by the promulgation of clear-cut plans and schemes but by the attempt to meet needs and opportunities as they arose and to gather the forces which the hour demanded. At the same time, when one reads the story of its preliminary years from 1905 to 1908, he finds everything forecast or suggested which has later taken form in the activities of the Council and its several departments. He discovers that in the preamble and the constitution of the Council there was latent as large a conception of the federal form of union as could possibly be developed.

Earlier movements had already demonstrated a great ideal, but it was soon discovered that what was needed was not an advance guard of prophets, but the unification of the great organized forces of the church. The three years 1905 to 1908 were given to patient consultation with the responsible leaders of these great forces and to a preliminary study of the problems to be met, so that when the representatives of these bodies came together in 1908, the coöperative thinking had been largely done and they were ready for action. Meanwhile it should be noted that in some local areas coöperative service had already been begun by the churches, in expression of a rapidly deepening consciousness.

The basis of organization was marked by a simplicity which was not, however, indefinite, but was the clear statement of the objective of this new movement as that of service. This united body of churches was "to express the fellowship and catholic unity of the Christian Church" in "united service for Christ and the World." Witness also its comprehensiveness. It was "to secure a larger combined influence for the churches of Christ in all matters affecting the moral and social condition of the people, so as to promote the application of the law of Christ in every relation of human life." Witness likewise the statesmanship of the men who drew up this simple document and their adjustment of this new unity to the freedom of its constituent bodies.

THE PROGRESS OF FEDERAL UNITY

At the Philadelphia meeting in 1908, a wide area of service was readily discovered which was not seriously involved in ecclesiastical differences or questions. Subjects were then considered which later became highly important forms of service: the church and modern industry, Christian education, family life. In these days, when international relations assume so large a place in the thinking of the churches, let us remind ourselves that the first clear and practical utterance of the churches looking toward the elimination of war was at this great meeting. Another example is that of week-day instruction in religion, which idea had one of its earliest expressions at Carnegie Hall in 1905 and again in Philadelphia in 1908.[4]

MILESTONES OF ADVANCE

More than once has the Council been called upon to revise its procedures. It began by districting the country for the immediate formation of state and local federations. The discovery was soon made, however, that it was a long distance from these coöperative thinkers associated with the national bodies down to the local areas and churches, and that before the local field was thus developed a federative program must not only be suggested and thought out but actually demonstrated to the churches. Therefore, in 1911, there began the expanding circle of these forms of service in the departments and commissions of the Council. The Commission on the Church and Social Service was the first to become an active body with adequate provision for administration in 1910. From this time on, year by year, the area has constantly enlarged. The Commission on Peace and Arbitration came into being in 1911, at a time when no denominational body had any board or committee dealing with the problem of peace and war; the Commission on Evangelism in the same year, when only one or two of the constituent elements of the Council had distinctly organized in this sovereign interest; in 1912, the Commission on Christian Education; in 1913, the Commission on the Church and Country Life and the establishment of administration at the capital of the nation; in 1914, the Commission on Relations with Japan (now the Committee on Relations with the Orient), which was organized to meet a great national emergency at the earnest request of the missionaries in that nation; in the same year, the committee to consider questions of relation between the white and colored races which in 1921 developed into the present Commission on Race Relations; in 1917, through the exigency of war, the General Committee on Army and Navy Chaplains and the Committee to develop religious work on a coöperative basis in the Canal Zone and the General Wartime Commission of the Churches with its many departments to meet a great national emergency; in 1919 the Commission on Relations with Religious Bodies in Europe which may be regarded as the first step toward the larger ecumenical fellowship which now assumes so important a place in the world relations of the churches, and in the same year, The Editorial

---

[4] George U. Wenner, now nearly ninety years of age and pastor of the church which he founded in 1868, was an early advocate of this plan.

Council of the Religious Press; in 1920, the Committee on Ecumenical Conference which convened the meeting at Geneva ultimately resulting in the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work at Stockholm; in 1922, the establishment of the Western Committee to meet the demand for wider territorial contact; in 1923, the Department of Research and Education, to supply the information needed as the basis of the service of all the other departments; in 1924, the Committees on Goodwill between Jews and Christians, on Relations with the Eastern Churches, on Mercy and Relief and on the Financial and Fiduciary Interests of the Churches; in 1927, the Committee on World Friendship among Children and in 1928, a new beginning in the development of state and local federations. In recent years has come the Committee on Marriage and the Home and the Committee on Worship. Thus has the movement progressed in ever-widening sweep.

From time to time special exigencies have been met by such bodies as the Joint Committee on Theological Seminaries and the Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook. Great occasions have been recognized: in 1914, the Committee of One Hundred on Religious Work at the Panama Pacific Exposition and the American Church Committee on the Peace Centenary with Canada; in 1915, a nation-wide movement for war relief for all the nations then involved in conflict; in 1917, the Committee on the Four Hundredth Anniversary of the Protestant Reformation; the American Huguenot Committee and later the Committee on Relief in France and Belgium for the churches of these nations; in 1919, the American Committee on the Mayflower Tercentenary and in 1922, the Huguenot Walloon New Netherlands Commission. Other special occasions were the Two Hundredth Anniversary of George Whitefield's mission and the Five Hundredth Anniversary of John Huss.

The Council has ever been ready for detached service. Time and again it has assisted the American Red Cross. It sent out the first letter for relief in connection with the Near East Relief. It has assisted in the China Famine and Flood Relief. It sent its special missionary with relief for the Russian churches at the time of the Russian famine and has from time to time rendered assistance to Herbert Hoover, especially in connection with the American Relief Administration.

More recently, the Council has availed itself in wide and still widening measure of the radio in giving the religious message to millions of the people. We have thus had a body representative of the varied churches ready to avail itself of these opportunities for service whenever they arose.

THE PROBLEM OF INTEGRATION

While it was extending itself over this wide area, thus meeting the requirements of the original plan of federation "in all matters affecting the moral and social condition of the people," it has for the most part maintained an ever-deepening relation to its constituent bodies. Sometimes it has unitedly expressed the judgment of them all, and at other times it has exercised leadership in helping them to form their judgments. It has endeavored to formulate its plans as the result of the widest coöperative thinking of the responsible leaders of its constituent bodies that it could command. At times it has performed service in behalf of the churches, while on other occasions and still oftener it has by counsel and advice led the denominational bodies themselves to undertake new tasks, more especially in social, international and race relations.

One of the most striking experiences has been the constant unity of these diverse elements. In the Council, on its executive and administrative committees have sat side by side theologically liberal and theologically conservative members. It has been both cautious and progressive. It has endeavored to carry its constituencies and avoided separating itself from them.

Few of the decisions of the administrative committee, the executive committee and of the Council itself, have not been entirely unanimous. Serious dissension has been absolutely unknown. So far as all this is true, it is because the Council has not sought primarily to exercise commanding leadership but to develop the coöperative thinking which must precede common action.

An observer of the acts and proceedings of the Council is impressed with the unfailing spirit of forbearance, concession, open-mindedness and singleness of thought, in discussion and in voting. Rarely are there differences of final judgment when a vote is taken. In these respects there are marked differences between the Federal Council and some denominational assemblies.

There have been those who have at times criticized the Council for what they have called its policy of opportunism. Let us frankly admit that in a true sense it has been opportunistic; has known that certain times were not the occasion to undertake certain things but has waited patiently until the time should come. Progressiveness has thus been steadied with patience and restraint. Social zealots have often been importunate in their burning ardor for enhanced excitement, sometimes about relatively inconsequential concerns. Studies of the Department of Research have been criticized because they were lacking in the "crusading" spirit and tone. New and detached groups have been formed to agitate because the Council refused to be deflected from the path of broad education into mere guerrilla warfare against evils.

On the other hand, cautious, timid and fearful conservators of things as they are have sought to stifle the spirit of adventure with outstretched hand to steady the ark.

The Council has generally listened without agitation or dismay. It has never been a bond servant to what is called "public opinion," but has sought to educate and create a public conscience to the end that in its advances it may have a sufficiently reliable body of the enlightened public in its support so that its progress may be constant and permanent. Opposition has been aroused. It is aroused today and will probably always be, more especially in connection with the Council's social program and its attitude on peace and war. The wonder is that such hostility has not been more disturbing than it has, for at times it has been sinister, subtle and determined. Its existence and its impotency testify alike to the power of a united force and constitute a call for both humility and courage.

There has been a conscious effort to keep the Council fluid rather than static. It has more than once changed its plans and redirected its forces and varied its emphasis. It has from time to time appointed detached groups to survey its highways, to criticize its procedures and to make constructive recommendations. While thus its course has sometimes seemingly lacked in constancy and in continuation of direction, it has always found its chart and compass in the original preamble and plan of federation.

Not until somewhat recently has the Federal Council or the things for which it stands reached the consciousness of the people of the nation as a whole, but today constant evidence is accumulating to indicate that the common people are beginning to realize the unity in spirit and in service of our Protestant forces and that they are hearing of it gladly. As an influence in the moral life of the nation, an acknowledged place has been gained which involves a deep responsibility.

During the next quadrennium the Federal Council should become more truly, as it is ideally, the sum of all its parts. There is need of still closer integration of its constituent bodies. The problem of relationship with the various interdenominational bodies representing denominational boards and departments should have attention, and this might even include some of the more voluntary bodies of similar nature.

The development of state and local federation calls above all for more coöperative thinking and service upon the part of state, regional and local denominational officials and leaders. This extension and localization of the coöperative movement should now be one of the major tasks.

The whole problem of the Council's relationship to other similar bodies will call for patient thought. Its constitutional basis is a large measure of its strength and the permanency of its service. This problem arose in connection with the Interchurch World Movement. As has been pointed out, the Federal Council wisely maintained at that time its constitutional identity and integrity. This it should continue to do, but at the same time it must express and practice to the fullest degree the coöperative spirit which it preaches and proclaims and must find the way of serving other interests than those which are committed to its especial care.

While the Council is distinctly prohibited from adopting forms of worship, many among us are deeply moved by the feeling that it ought to find a way of helping to restore among our people the devotional spirit which, in their concern for practical duty and interest, has been so largely lost. Not only do we need more dignity and quiet worshipfulness in our forms of service, but the cultivation of reverence and the spirit of worship in personal attitude and life.

Two phrases of the constitution express the basis and the purpose of the Federal Council: one is in the preamble and the other in the plan. "To manifest our essential oneness in Jesus Christ as Divine Lord and Saviour," "so as to promote the application of the law of Christ to every relation of human life." Two things the church needs today. The one is spiritual authority, the other human sympathy. The Federal Council must ever seek to lead the churches to the Mountain of Transfiguration and if it does there will be found One who will Himself lead them to the plain below of human life and service. The demons to be cast out, of social wrong, of prejudice of race, of ignorance and of brutal war—this kind cometh out only by fasting and by prayer.

SUMMARY

Reviewing this record by quadrennial periods, we may say that, first of all, the period from 1905 to 1908 was that of surveying and planning. From 1908 to 1912, was largely a period of experimentation. From 1912 to 1916, we found the method of departmental extension. Then came, from 1916 to 1920, an era of national emergency. The post-war meeting of the Council at Cleveland with its subject and object designated by the title "From World War to World Brotherhood" marked the beginning of a new spirit so far as the churches are concerned. The period from 1920 to 1928, and the last quadrennium up to the present time, have been more than anything else characterized by the increasing integration and support of the constituent bodies and their boards.

Associated Bodies in Federal Unity

Meanwhile, the related forms of federal unity have developed a parallel and related progress—in the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, the Home Missions Council, the International Council of Religious Education and other bodies representing particular spheres of the work of the churches. This whole field needs to be taken into view as we consider the progress of federal unity. It appears again in the chapter on Areas of Unity.

These bodies representing distinct departments of the common work of the churches have at times outdistanced the Federal Council. In instances of their administrative skill and executive leadership they have sometimes equaled or surpassed it. The writer finds it difficult to refrain from recording the story of their contributions to the progress of federal unity and does so only because of the restraining hand of the publishers. The story of the Federal Council, thus, is but an illustration of the whole federative idea, its one distinction being that it represents the churches as a whole and is thus an epitome of the vast movement of which it is a symbol and a coördinating agency. Moreover, the Federal Council more distinctively embodies the principle of federal unity, while the other bodies are more closely confined to the coöperative stage, although it should be said that this is a distinction not always true in practice.

A quarter century is a short period for a movement under the guidance of One with whom a thousand years are but as a day, but it may be doubted if anywhere in history we shall find an institution of its nature which has grown more rapidly.[5] Certainly at least we have a sufficient basis of knowledge and experience on which to build. The whole movement for Christian unity, as we shall see later on, is finding its way now into the path thus followed, whatever the more remote future may have in store.

---

[5] For the full record see "Twenty Years of Church Federation." Edited by Rev. Samuel McCrea Cavert. Federal Council, 1928.

CHAPTER VI

WORLD MOVEMENTS FOR FEDERAL UNITY

As has been recorded, contact and consultation between religious bodies in the old and new worlds took place from time to time in foreign mission advance in the early part of the nineteenth century, including association in the foreign field itself. These contacts, however, were temporary for the most part and were voluntary. The Evangelical Alliance was a world-wide body of Christians from its very beginning. The World's Sunday School Association held conventions as early as 1889. The foreign mission bodies held later conferences looking toward world inclusiveness. The Young Men's Christian Association and associated bodies and later the Young Women's Christian Association assumed similar proportions. Thus the way was prepared for Christian unity by groups of Christians devoted to special objects, such as the World's Christian Endeavor Union.

Previous to the World War, however, there had been little contact, at least of a practical or progressive nature, between the *churches* of the United States and those of Europe, or between those of Europe itself, except that constituted by denominational bodies, and in this case the relationships were often far from being intimate. The only international bodies of churches were essentially denominational.[1] While these denominational alliances and ecumenical bodies were concerned mainly with their own unification, they have not been without value to the larger unity by developing fellowship across national lines and have in some measure prepared the way for more inclusive unity. Moreover the Evangelical Alliance had created a spirit which continued after its disappearance as an organized world body.

---

[1] "International Christian Movements" by Charles S. Macfarland. Revell, 1924.

INFLUENCES OF THE WAR

In August, 1914, the very day that war was declared, the first International Church Peace Conference, arranged by the Church Peace Union (founded by Andrew Carnegie),[2] was convening in Constance, Germany, eventuating in the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches. The American members of this conference were for the most part officers or committee members officially appointed by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

In 1914 and 1915 the churches of France and Belgium sent messengers to the United States for relief funds and the Federal Council undertook the task thus brought to its door. In 1915, following the annual meeting of the Executive Committee of the Council, its General Secretary was sent on a fraternal visit to the churches of the warring countries, also to Holland and Switzerland, and on his return a general war relief movement was instituted by the Federal Council in behalf of all of the suffering countries, this being done in coöperation with the various national agencies for relief set up in the United States. Meanwhile continued help was sought and found for the churches in France and Belgium [2a] and, as has been stated, the Federal Council also sent out the first letter to the churches, appealing in behalf of the work undertaken by the body which later became the Near East Relief. Several denominational bodies also sent large contributions to their affiliated churches in Europe. Meanwhile, both during the war and immediately following it, there was considerable interchange of messengers between the churches of Europe and the United States, furthered by the Federal Council. Thus in a perfectly natural way new relationships were being established with the churches across the sea. When the Armistice came, the Federal Council undertook to raise the funds for the devastated churches of France and to meet other needs caused by the exigencies of the war carried on in that country. As soon as normal relations with Europe were established it became apparent that this relief work, sponsored and administered by the Federal Council, would need to be enlarged. A special committee was at once set up to secure funds for the German women and children.

---

[2] Mr. Carnegie often insisted that the Christian churches could dispose of war if they were only united.

[2a] The most unselfish service has been rendered his churches and his nation, in administering this work, by Pastor André Monod of Paris.

When the Federal Council held its post-war meeting in Cleveland in 1919, the Swiss churches, in response to an invitation, sent as their fraternal messenger Adolf Keller, who became later the Secretary of the Swiss Church Federation. Largely as the result of conference with Dr. Keller,[8] the Swiss churches, whose leaders had proposed coöperative relief measures, were invited by the Federal Council to unite with it in organizing a general relief movement for all the needy churches of Europe. This conference was convened at Copenhagen in 1922, and has been known as the Bethesda Conference because it was held in a church of that name. It was composed of representatives of practically all the church bodies of Europe and the United States. The spirit of fellowship in the Bethesda Conference was so strong and contagious that several earnest European leaders proposed the immediate formation of a Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in Europe. Upon more mature reflection, however, it seemed better to await the forming of closer ties through what Dr.

---

[8] Dr. Keller has rendered a preëminent and unselfish service from this time on. Shortly after his return home, he became the leading spirit in organizing the Swiss Church Federation.

Knubel of the United Lutheran Church calls "works of serving love."

The Central Bureau of Relief for the Evangelical Churches of Europe [4] was organized, to include the Federal Council, the Swiss churches, and representatives of the previously neutral countries of Europe, giving or prepared to give assistance. This body is now known as the Central Bureau for Interchurch Aid and includes all the European bodies. Entirely apart from the service this organization has rendered in its own sphere, it has been a powerful creative factor in the internationalizing of federal unity and is perhaps a good illustration of the opportunistic and simple way in which great movements arise. Dr. Keller, who was made its director, constantly went about among the churches in the needy sections of Europe, made frequent visits to the United States, and thus, through these acts of brotherly service, a new spirit and state of mind has been developed among the churches of Europe and between the churches of Europe and those of the United States. Indeed, many of the factors creating our present unity have been indirect and unpremeditated. The new relationship between the Eastern Churches and those of the United States was very largely brought about and encouraged by the Near East Relief.[4a]

At the very beginning of the war in 1914 the Archbishop of Upsala, Dr. Nathan Soederblom, had prepared a message from the churches in neutral countries to the churches in the warring countries which was signed by himself, by the President and General Secretary of the Federal Council, and by representatives of churches in Europe. It appealed to the churches not to let the war break down their spiritual unity. Meanwhile, both during and since the war, the World Alliance for

[4] Executive direction of this movement in the United States has been performed, with rare efficiency, by Rev. Chauncey W. Goodrich, Rev. Kenneth D. Miller, and Miss Antonia H. Froendt.

[4a] See "The Story of Near East Relief" by James L. Barton. Macmillan, 1930. This work was largely due to the initiative and devoted executive leadership of Charles V. Vickrey.

International Friendship through the Churches has been developing a new spirit of brotherhood.[5] All these and many others have been paths to unity or have opened them up.

Indeed, it is a commonplace of history that it constantly reveals the essential and often the empirical unity of mankind, and that no great movement ever originates from any one given source. During all this modern period the same forces and impulsions were at work in other parts of the world, revealed not only in the original ecumenical character of the Evangelical Alliance, but also in the succeeding federal movement. It is also true in history that ultimately all such human movements find their way together.

It is not out of place to say that personal relationships have been of no little significance in the development of international unity and that in no small measure it has had its inception through those associations of personal friendship, confidence and trust, as individual leaders have come to know one another, which, after all, are the choicest treasures of human life. They go much farther than formal meetings for dialectical discussions and debate, in discovering the truths and ideals which men have in common.

World Unity in Foreign Missions

The story of the modern approach to federal unity in the field of foreign missions is of deep interest, but would require a volume. It involved a long series of steps, including conferences on the foreign field during the nineteenth and the early part of the twentieth century. In the winter of 1912-13 alone there were twenty-one such conferences in India, the Straits Settlements, China, Japan and Chosen. They were broad in scope, including field occupation, evangelization, native leadership, missionary training, education and literature, medical work, comity, coöperation and unity.[6]

---

[5] This body, instituted largely through Frederick Lynch of the Church Peace Union, has rendered a service of its own, both nationally and internationally, administered now with rare effectiveness in arousing interest in Peace by Henry A. Atkinson, Harry N. Holmes and Linley V. Gordon, in association with colleagues across the sea.

The story of foreign missions and unity illustrates the need of time and patience in the attainment of unity. But, even so, we discover marvelous progress when we compare earlier divisive days with the present in the light of such bodies, for example, as the present Christian Council of China. It is of especial interest to note that unity at home has come largely from its initiation out in the field, both in the United States and in Europe.

Interdenominational conferences and unions in the mission field began at an early date. One was held at Calcutta, India, in 1855, and similar conferences at the home base began in the United States as early as 1854. The London Missionary Society had long been active in coöperative effort.

The Edinburgh Conference was the culmination of a series of international and interdenominational conferences extending over half a century. Perhaps the first that could be thus designated was that in New York in 1854. The second was held in London later in the same year. Others followed, and in 1888, in commemoration of the centenary of modern Protestant missions, one was held in London, inclusive of British, Continental, Colonial and American societies.

In 1900 the "Ecumenical Missionary Conference," held in New York, was attended by about seventeen hundred widely representative delegates of mission bodies from the United States, Canada, Great Britain and continental Europe, and about six hundred foreign missionaries. Forty-eight different countries were represented.

The Edinburgh Conference grew naturally out of this succession of meetings. The patience required in such efforts is illustrated by this half century of preparation for a movement of such vast proportions and diversities. This was the first conference to be confined to officially and proportionally appointed delegates and it took two years to arrange for it.

---

[6] "Christian Coöperation and World Redemption"—edited by Charles S. Macfarland, Part III—"Coöperation in Foreign Missions"—by Robert E. Speer—Missionary Education Movement, 1917, also "Christian Unity at Work." Section III, "Coöperation on the Foreign Field"—by James L. Barton, Federal Council 1912.

It will again be noticed that this movement began by voluntary, followed by semi-voluntary bodies, before becoming ecclesiastical in nature.

THE EDINBURGH CONFERENCE

So far as the internationalization of Christian unity is concerned, too high a place cannot be given to the missionary conference at Edinburgh in 1910, followed as it was by the work of its Continuation Committee. Largely under the guidance of Dr. John R. Mott, this work was carried on in nearly all parts of the foreign field, where local and regional conferences were held over a considerable period of years. These conferences and the services of the Continuation Committee of the Edinburgh Conference have not only largely influenced the progress of unity in foreign mission fields, but have been constantly creating a new state of mind throughout the church as a whole. Six years later, in 1916, the Congress on Christian Work in Latin America, better known as the Panama Congress, was held in the Canal Zone. It was a very representative body and greatly furthered the work of the Committee on Coöperation in Latin America.[7] While this was the meeting of an American Section, provision was made for a European Section.

The first approach of the federal movement to the churches themselves, as we have noted, came in the foreign mission field. Likewise, it may be said that the world movement for federal unity began with foreign missions in the Edinburgh Conference. It went far beyond distinctively organizational foreign mission interests in its resolutions as follows:

---

[7] Samuel G. Inman has rendered devoted service for many years, as Executive Secretary of this Committee.

> "That a Continuation Committee of the World Missionary Conference be appointed, international and representative in character, to carry out, on the lines of the Conference itself, which are interdenominational and do not involve the idea of organic and ecclesiastical union, the following duties:
>
> "(1) To maintain in prominence the idea of the World Missionary Conference as a means of coordinating missionary work, of laying sound lines for future development, and of generating and claiming by corporate action fresh stores of spiritual force for the evangelisation of the world.
>
> "(2) To finish any further investigations, or any formulation of the results of investigations, which may remain after the World Missionary Conference is over, and may be referred to it.
>
> "(3) To consider when a further World Missionary Conference is desirable, and to make the initial preparations.
>
> "(4) To devise plans for maintaining the intercourse which the World Missionary Conference has stimulated between different bodies of workers, e.g., by literature or by a system of correspondence and mutual report, or the like.
>
> "(5) To place its services at the disposal of the Home Boards in any steps which they may be led to take (in accordance with the recommendation of more than one Commission) towards closer mutual counsel and practical cooperation.
>
> "(6) To confer with the Societies and Boards as to the best method of working towards the formation of such a permanent International Missionary Committee as is suggested by the Commissions of the Conference and by various missionary bodies apart from the Conference.[8]
>
> "(7) And to take such steps as may seem desirable to carry

---

[8] "The principles on which the Commission are agreed constructive work could be built are stated in their report as follows:

"(a) It should from the beginning be precluded from handling matters which are concerned with the doctrinal or ecclesiastical differences of the various denominations.

"(b) This being assured, it would be desirable that it should be as widely representative as possible.

"(c) Yet it should be a purely consultative and advisory Association, exercising no authority but such as would accrue to it through the intrinsic value of the services that it may be able to render."

out, by the formation of Special Committees or otherwise, any practical suggestions made in the Reports of the Commissions."

THE INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL

Thus the way was prepared for the International Missionary Council [9] and for its great meeting at Jerusalem in 1928, the intervening period being occupied by continued conferences, both at the home bases and in the foreign field, the latter largely under the guiding genius and inspiration of John R. Mott. The plans of the Edinburgh Conference had been, of course, interrupted and delayed by the war.

At this historic meeting in the land of the Savior's birth and ministry, a new level of Christian unity was reached. The significance of this movement in the advance of unity may best be revealed in the messages issued by the International Missionary Council.

At Oxford, England, in 1923, the question of doctrinal differences was cleared, in a rather laborious statement, which has considerable bearing on later chapters of this volume:

Resolution of the International Missionary Council at Oxford on Missionary Coöperation in View of Doctrinal Differences

"The International Missionary Council has given attention to the anxiety which is felt in many quarters about the possibility of missionary cooperation in face of doctrinal differences and thinks it opportune to review the cooperation which has actually been undertaken under its auspices or those of the national and other councils which it correlates and other similar cooperative action, and to set out afresh the principles which have emerged from these experiences.

"The International Missionary Council has never sought nor is it its function to work out a body of doctrinal opinions of its own. The only doctrinal opinions in the Council are those which the various members bring with them into it from the churches and missionary boards to which they belong. It is no part of the duty of the Council to discuss the merits of those opinions, still less to determine doctrinal questions.

---

[9] The executive of this body in North America is A. L. Warnshuis.

"But it has never been found in practice that in consequence of this the Council is left with nothing but an uncertain mass of conflicting opinions. The Council is conscious of a great measure of agreement which centers in a common obligation and a common loyalty. We are conscious of a common obligation to proclaim the Gospel of Christ in all the world, and this sense of obligation is made rich and deep because of our knowledge of the havoc wrought by sin and of the efficacy of the salvation offered by Christ. We are bound together further by a common loyalty to Jesus Himself, and this loyalty is deep and fruitful because we rejoice to share the confessions of St. Peter, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God,' and of St. Thomas, 'My Lord and My God.' The secret of our cooperation is the presence with us of Jesus Christ, Human Friend and Divine Helper. From this common obligation and this common loyalty flow many other points of agreement, and our differences in doctrine, great though in some instances they are, have not hindered us from profitable cooperation in counsel. When we have gathered together, we have experienced a growing unity among ourselves, in which we recognize the influence of the Holy Spirit. At these meetings we have come to a common mind on many matters and been able to frame recommendations and statements. These have never had the character of command or direction, and it has always rested with the churches or missions to give them, if they would, authority by adopting them or carrying them into action.

"Cooperation in work is more likely to be embarrassed by doctrinal differences than cooperation in Council. Yet there is a wide range of matters such as negotiations with governments, the securing of religious liberty, the combating of the evils arising from the sale of narcotic drugs, collection and survey of facts, investigation of educational method, etc., which are not affected by doctrinal differences. A still more imposing list might be drawn up of types of work in which impediments from doctrinal differences might have been anticipated, but experience in many lands has shown that most valuable cooperation is possible between many churches and missions. Such are the translation of the Holy Scriptures, the production and dissemination of Christian literature, the conduct of schools and colleges and medical institutions, and provision for the training of missionaries. Every piece of cooperation in work which this Council or, as we believe, any council connected with it encourages or guides is confined to those churches or missions which freely and willingly take part in it. It would be entirely out of harmony with the spirit of this movement to press for such cooperation in work as would be felt to compromise doctrinal principles or to strain consciences."

More important, however, than such interpretations as these, are the Christian messages to the world sent out by the three great world conferences of Stockholm, Lausanne and Jerusalem. A study of them will reveal the heart and soul of Christian unity, far more than the discussions and records of the conferences themselves. They were often lost sight of and it will be by a return to them that the churches will find their way.

At Jerusalem, there was sent forth to the world a message so clear and persuasive that, if it does not bring a living and visible unity in foreign missions to this generation, the world to whom it is addressed will lose its faith in the Christian church. The unity there assumed cannot be expressed and realized merely by an occasional world conference and an annual continuation committee.

The conference endeavored to translate "the essential spiritual unity already existing among Christians" into organized practice.[10]

The message [11] opens with a depressing view of world conditions, but with the witness of the higher aspirations of humanity which are struggling for expression in the midst of world disorder. This is the call of the world to the Christian church.

Jesus is the answer and the *"desire for unity is centered in his person."* The message of the churches gathered there at Jerusalem is—Jesus Christ, revealing God to man.

For its interpretation the Conference includes the identical message of the World Conference on Faith and Order, held at Lausanne the previous year.

---

[10] Appendix II.

[11] Appendix I.

After a fine analysis of the missionary motive and task and a plan of organization, the churches at Jerusalem unite in declaring

> "We are called today to a new discovery of spiritual unity, faith and power that we may prove our message to be adequate to a world need. . . . Only as we come back to the place called Calvary can we see the hindrances of our divisions and the failures of our Christian expression throughout the world."

Thus we have one world-wide body in this great task of the Christian church. It covers, however, but one phase of Christian service, albeit a most significant one.

Meanwhile, however, a comprehensive world federal council was finding its way, largely patterned after the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, in which that body has exercised no inconsiderable influence and leadership.

The Universal Christian Council on Life and Work

As has already been recorded, the Archbishop of Upsala appealed to the churches of the world in 1914 to maintain their spiritual unity and not let the war destroy it. In 1916, at the Quadrennial meeting of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America at St. Louis the General Secretary, in his report, recommended that provision be made for a World Conference of the Churches to follow the war. The General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church also sent an overture to the Federal Council as follows:

> "We recommend: That the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America be requested to arrange for a Council of Churches to meet at the time and place of the European peace conference to devise plans for reestablishment of cooperation and the more complete articulation of righteousness and peace and the advancement of the Kingdom of Heaven on earth."

The Council authorized the Administrative Committee to take such action. In a visitation to the European churches in 1915-16 the General Secretary of the Federal Council had previously conferred with the groups which he met on this proposal with a generally sympathetic response.

The first meeting of an international character to follow the war was that of the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches at Oud Wassenaer, Holland. Overtures, repeating the recommendation, came to this meeting from the Swiss Church Federation, the Federal Council, and the Archbishop of Upsala, and an advisory group was named consisting of Dr. Soederblom, Dean O. Herold of Switzerland, and the General Secretary of the Federal Council, who proposed that a larger committee be appointed to consider the question. This committee, consisting of representatives of the Scandinavian, Swiss and American churches, met in Paris and requested the Rev. Frederick Lynch to secure the initiative of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. A Committee of the Federal Council on Ecumenical Conference in 1920 took the following action:

> "Voted: To recommend to the Federated Bodies of Churches and similar joint Committees or other joint Bodies of the Churches in the various nations that a conference of their representatives be held in Geneva August 10 and 11, 1920; the purpose of this Conference being to confer upon the calling of an ecumenical conference of church bodies to consider the urgent practical tasks of Christian life and service and the possibilities of world-wide cooperation in testimony and action;
>
> "Voted: That the Constituent Bodies of the Federal Council be requested to officially authorize the members of the Federal Council Committee on Ecumenical Conference to represent them in that capacity."

The General Secretary of the Federal Council was instructed to communicate these actions to the bodies concerned. The result was that a conference representative mainly of the church bodies of Europe and the United States met at Geneva August 10th and 11th, 1920. This was the first occasion on which it may be said that the churches themselves had met in a widely representative body for four hundred years. While the Eastern Orthodox Churches were not officially represented, messengers from those bodies were received and expressed their sympathy.

After five years of preparation the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work and its several commissions met for several weeks in 1925 at Stockholm.

A plan for discussion had been largely provided by the Conference on Christian Politics, Economics and Citizenship[12] in England, popularly known as "Copec," held a short time before. The subjects treated at Stockholm were:

The Church's Obligation in view of God's Purpose for the World.
The Church and Economic and Industrial Problems
The Church and Social and Moral Problems
The Church and International Relations
The Church and Christian Education
Methods of Cooperative and Federative Efforts by the Christian Communions.

The discussions were relieved by seasons of prayer and worship.

It was a very representative body, the members having been, in most cases, officially delegated by church bodies. Its work was undertaken with deep seriousness. There were differences of opinion and conviction but no polemics.

The message[13] issued by this body was addressed both to the church and to the world at large. The basis of this epistle is in substance the same as that of the International Missionary Council at Jerusalem, with greater emphasis, of course, on the social mission of the Christian church. The unity of the church, as declared by the Stockholm message, rests upon

---

[12] Miss Lucy Gardner was its moving spirit.

[13] Appendix III.

"Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord." "The nearer we come to the Crucified the nearer we come to one another." "Leaving for the time our differences in faith and order, our aim has been to secure united practical action in Christian life and work."

The reports issued on the several phases of the work of the churches, revealed a striking unanimity of spirit, although not all of the national sections were at one on the place of the social gospel.

While there have been many problems to be met and the Continuation Committee of the Conference had no ready funds whatever at its disposal, administration being consequently embarrassed, the development of this body has been remarkable. Meetings of the Continuation Committee have been held from year to year. Headquarters have been established on the shores of Lake Geneva, and in 1931 the Continuation Committee made provision for a second conference to be held in 1935, or later, and recommended to its constituent bodies a change of name to the Universal Christian Council on Life and Work.

In 1931 arrangements were made for transferring the headquarters of the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches from London to Geneva, and a coöperative arrangement has been effected which, to all intents and purposes, constitutes the World Alliance as an agency for International Relations of the Universal Christian Council under a general administration.[14] The Council has established a Department of Research in consultative relationship with the same department of the International Missionary Council. Thus these several international agencies are finding their way together and it may be said that we now have at Geneva, as expressions of the whole movement for federal unity, bodies representative of the non-Roman churches of the world.

---

[14] Administrative service was rendered by Dr. Henry A. Atkinson and Dr. Adolf Keller until 1932 when it was assumed by Mr. H. L. Henriod.

In the headquarters of the Council at Geneva are now assembled in autonomous but coöperative or consultative relationships, the Central Bureau for Inter-Church Aid, the Department of Research of the International Missionary Council, the International Christian Social Institute, the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches and other Christian bodies. The world committees of the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations and the Christian Student Federation are also in Geneva.

The American Section of the Universal Christian Council on Life and Work is the Department on Relations with Churches Abroad of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

Federal Unity in Europe

In the Universal Christian Council we have the first effective relationship established between the Eastern or Greek Orthodox churches, and the Anglican and Protestant church bodies. While the Eastern churches did not send delegates to the preliminary conference in Geneva in 1920, a group of their officials visited the conference with a sympathetic message and at the Stockholm Conference they were officially represented. Meanwhile, the movement for federal unity has been finding its world-wide way. There are now bodies similar to the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America in several of the countries of Europe which have any considerable number of church bodies. For the most part they are based on the fundamental principles embodied in the constitution of the Federal Council and, so far as Europe is concerned, their stimulation has been measurably due to the relief work carried on by the Central Bureau for Inter-Church aid, which is a coöperative agency of the European bodies through the official election of their representatives on its International Committee.[15] There are now federal councils or some similar organization in Great Britain, France, Germany, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Poland, Austria and Spain. In Hungary there are common agencies and in Sweden the groups concerned with international relations are united. The French Protestant Federation occupies a building of its own with its affiliated and coöperating bodies, both interdenominational and denominational, presented to it by the American Churches through the Federal Council. As an instance of world-wide working of the spirit of God it is of interest to note that the French Protestant Federation and the American Federal Council both came into being in the same year.

As an illustration of the wide variation in the impulse to unity and of the underlying forces the National Council of Evangelical Free Churches of Great Britain is a striking example. The difference between the basis of this body and that of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America is noteworthy. The latter body is based upon and inclusive of the national church bodies, while the Free Church Council is built up from local councils in which the membership is voluntary. Another distinctive difference is that the Free Church Council has been very considerably concerned with political affairs, largely, however, in defense of the rights of the free churches in a nation which had a state church. Therefore in 1917 another body was formed, the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches, with a membership of official representatives from the churches as such. This body has a committee of conference with the Church of England in connection with the Lambeth appeal for reunion as issued in 1920.

Indeed, while the church bodies of Europe and the United States had until recently very slight contact, much the same processes were finding their way in each continent.[16] The foreign mission agencies in France and the Theological Faculty of Paris have long been interdenominational. The former have an attractive building in Paris. The Inner Mission in Germany has also long been a unified body.

---

[15] The American consulting representatives are Henry S. Leiper and the author.

The development of federal unity in continental Europe has, in some ways, been as striking as in the United States. While there are only two major Protestant bodies, the Lutheran and the Reformed, there are several others, largely introduced by the missionary bodies of the United States and to a lesser degree of Great Britain.

Moreover, while in the United States the several denominations were in one body politic, on the European continent they were nationally divided, so that when the Great War came their denominational unity not only counted for little or nothing but perhaps actually accentuated feelings of hostility. Indeed the writer recalls his visit to the warring countries in 1916, when he found the church leaders exercising a leadership which was far from Christian, as many did in the United States where there was far less excuse for it. M. Aristide Briand constantly pleaded for a federation of European nations. Likewise it is altogether probable that ultimately there may be a Federal Council of the Churches of Europe[17] as an integral part of the Universal Christian Council on Life and Work. The effect of such a body, in softening national animosities between nations, can hardly be overestimated, especially if it included the Eastern churches. The International European Protestant Loan Association, organized for the purpose of loaning money to needy church agencies in the various countries, is an indication of a new sense of stewardship and Christian fraternity.

---

[16] See "Protestant Europe: Its Crisis and Outlook" by Adolf Keller and George Stewart. Doran, 1927.

[17] René Wallau, a young pastor in Frankfort, urges that the Central Bureau be transformed into a European federation, in his illuminating volume *Die Einigung der Kirche,* which ought to have been translated into English, as it gives us a Continental point of view.

In the further development of continental unity the boards of American churches which have propagated work among the national populations in Europe have a responsibility to the indigenous churches in the way of coöperation and comity which they have not always fulfilled. Another form of friendly invasion has been the establishment of English-speaking churches, by church bodies in the United States and Great Britain, which, through neglect of consultation, has resulted in both overlapping and overlooking. There are many such opportunities for larger fellowship and better service.

The ecumenical spirit is gathering strength and this has its effect on the Lutheran bodies which compose so large a proportion of Protestant Europe. It is of interest at this point to call attention to significant happenings of recent years.

In 1929 a large number of Lutherans met with representative leaders of the Reformed and other churches at historic Marburg, in recognition of the four hundredth anniversary of the colloquy between Luther and Zwingli. It is of significance to note that an event which symbolized division was celebrated by a fraternal assembly at which the spirit of fellowship was so strong that a Lutheran went so far as to propose reunion of the Lutheran and Reformed churches.

Again, in 1930, at Augsburg, the Augsburg Confession was recognized by a gathering, arranged by the German Church Federation, composed ecumenically. When we recall that this Confession had been, shall we say, severely critical of the Reformed Church and had excluded Zwingli, the participation of leaders of that church in the celebration of the Confession as a mutual possession, is not without significance, even though the Lutherans did follow it with a separate recognition of their own.

On another recent occasion the World Presbyterian and Reformed Alliance and the World Lutheran Convention, meeting at the same time, exchanged warmly fraternal messages. Lutherans are included in such bodies as the French Protestant Federation and the German Church Federation.

During the Lausanne conference there were meetings of an informal nature, between Lutheran and Reformed leaders, looking toward the integration of Protestant forces in Europe. These close fellowships are of no small significance and they doubtless promise much for the future. In Galicia there is intercommunion between the Lutheran and Reformed congregations, in one common service, the members of each body, however, using their own form in the reception of the emblems.

The form of unity expressed in the Universal Christian Council on Life and Work appears to be taken very seriously in Europe.

In practically all foreign mission lands there are now Christian councils or federations of churches, constituent bodies of the International Missionary Council.

The same forces are at work in other sections of the world including Australia and New Zealand. In Scotland and Canada organic union has been effected between different bodies and, as has been mentioned, the several Methodist bodies in England have just united.

Internationally federal unity has thus taken form in the Universal Christian Council on Life and Work and the International Missionary Council.

While thus far we have traced what has seemed to be an empirical and pragmatic approach to unity, it has been still more a growing realization of the essential unity of spirit and purpose long existing. Here for the first time in the history of the Christian church a course has been pursued unobstructed by academic discussion. It may be said that it was the hearts and desire of men at work together, rather than their intellects alone. Although it should be noted that at Stockholm, diversities in mentality and temperamentality appeared between, for example, the American delegates and some of those from Germany, on social Christianity, the contrast between these differences and the previous differences in the history of the church was that in this case, different from the ancient church councils, they led to the spirit of liberty instead of to that of ecclesiastical conformity and tended to enlargement rather than attrition, to unity instead of division. At Stockholm, while the subjects were those comprehended under Life and Work, several impressive services of united worship were held, thus revealing the essential unity of faith, using that word in the sense in which Jesus used it.

It may be said, without reservation, that world-wide federal unity has made a progress in one short decade which, when history comes to be written in perspective, will reveal, above all else, the world-wide working of the Spirit of God. The messages of the Universal Christian Council and the International Missionary Council reveal the essential unity of the non-Roman churches of the world, not only in service but in Christian faith and experience.

CHAPTER VII

THE PRESENT AREAS, IN SERVICE, OF FEDERAL UNITY IN THE UNITED STATES

THE areas of service in which, through coöperation, the churches are moving toward enlarging federal unity were indicated by the organizations described in Chapter I of this volume. At first sight it is a complicated picture, with wheels within wheels, and, as we shall see later, there is opportunity for some simplification.

We need to remind ourselves, however, that we live in what is known as a "machine age." We have the same problem politically and socially in the Congress of the United States and the several states, and in the League of Nations and the International Labor Organization. In social relations it is paralleled in the organizations for social welfare, in the labor movement and in business life. Indeed, the multitude of secular public welfare agencies presents a more complicated problem than that of the church bodies. Their name is legion and they are often uncoöperative. The churches are dealing with this much organized society and their areas of service are largely determined by it. The age is one of specialization to a high degree. Edward A. Filene [1] and Madame Lombroso [2] tell us that the only remedy is statesmanship and Mr. Filene believes that religious leaders have abundant opportunity for its exercise. He urges it with insight and persuasiveness.

---

[1] "Successful Living in this Machine Age" by Edward A. Filene. Simon and Schuster, 1932.

[2] "The Tragedies of Progress" by Gina Lombroso. Dutton, 1932.

Moreover, the complication is not due to federal unity; it is caused by this same problem within the several Christian denominations. The Federal Council, for example, is far less complicated and much more unified than almost any major denominational body. The solution calls for more federal unity, not less. The budget of the entire Federal Council is less than the amount spent by several of its constituent bodies solely for the coördination of their work. On the other hand, also, there is need of decentralization as well as unity. As has already been observed, the uniformity of the Roman Catholic Church must not be our ideal.

We shall not attempt, in this chapter, to give historical accounts of the organizations occupied in these areas of service. The process of development, in each instance, has been the same as that of the Federal Council. It would require several volumes to record it.

As we have seen in a previous chapter, the Federal Council, at the beginning, was obliged to proceed from the concrete to the abstract and to exercise opportunism in finding its way. In other words, the movement for federal unity has had to apply itself in those spheres of church work for which the constituent churches and their boards were ready. We may now make a brief survey of the areas of service in which the bodies representing federal unity have found it possible to exercise it.

FOREIGN MISSIONS

The first of these, in point of time, has been the field of foreign missions, through the Foreign Missions Conference of North America[8] and similar bodies in other countries, resulting in the International Missionary Council. The development of the Foreign Missions Conference in the enlargement of its areas of service, while not rapid, has been one of constant advance and that body has become something much more than a simple annual conference, as may have been at first intended. This has been largely due to the insistent reactions that have come from the foreign field and some of its missionaries to what is known as the home base. For a considerable time there was a rapidly growing coöperation out in the field which outdistanced the coöperative procedures at home in the Foreign Missions Conference. Indeed, in some sections of the foreign field a form approaching organic union has been effected, notably in India.[4] In all the foreign fields there are federated bodies of mission agencies and institutions and in many cases federations of churches.

---

[8] The Executive Secretary is Leslie B. Moss.

It would require a volume in itself to survey the progress of coöperation and unity in this field.[4a]

HOME MISSIONS AND COMITY

Home missions was the earliest objective of the federal movement here at home through the Home Missions Council, whose organization was perfected in 1908, contemporarily with the completion of the Federal Council. The recent Home Missions Congress at Washington in 1930, in its program and proposals, would have startled even the younger and more progressive members of the Home Missions Council of twenty years ago. Within the past few years the Federal Council, the Home Missions Council and the Council of Women for Home Missions have been coördinating their forces and unifying their service so that today, in those fields which are mutual, they act as one body. The needed process of simplification has thus begun. For example, when the problem raised by the development of the community churches became significant it was met by a committee representative of the Federal Council, the Home Missions Council and the Community Church Workers.

---

[4] See Chapter X, the description of the South India United Church in the Lambeth encyclical of 1930.

[4a] While there are many volumes comprising this record, it is to be hoped that a comprehensive history of coöperation and unity will be prepared in connection with the current Foreign Missions Inquiry.

Perhaps no more important area of united service has appeared than that of the establishment of what is known as the principle and practice of comity. This relates to the establishment and distribution of churches. This phase of coöperation is so important that its history is worthy of a brief recital. The first carefully detailed proposal for actual comity and coöperation between local churches of different denominations was made in a written form in 1883, by Dr. Washington Gladden, at the time pastor of a Congregational Church in Hartford, Connecticut. It was published in the *Century Magazine* in a series of articles under the title "The Christian League of Connecticut." This well thought-out statement made a deep impression. It set in motion certain spiritual undercurrents of thought, feeling and determination which first reached expression at the surface of Christian consciousness in the spring of 1890. Then a Methodist pastor of Auburn, Maine, Rev. Charles S. Cummings, appointed as a fraternal delegate from his Methodist Conference to the Congregational Conference of Maine, and unable to attend in person, wrote a letter of fraternal greetings, in which he deplored the rivalries between denominations in small communities, and the consequent waste of efforts and resources which rendered small churches in the small communities of the state pitifully fragmentary and ineffective. William DeWitt Hyde, President of Bowdoin College, who had already made studies and written articles in various magazines, on "Impending Paganism in New England," heard these words, and by motion secured the appointment of a committee and the formulation of an overture to other denominational organizations of the state that each should appoint a similar committee for mutual and joint consultation on the subject.

President Hyde invited a preliminary gathering of denominational representatives to be his guests at Brunswick, Maine, in July, 1890. This was probably the first assemblage of ecclesiastical representatives bent solely upon the purpose of allying administrative denominational organizations in common plans and programs which would affect the unified alignment and service of local churches.

In November, 1891, delegates of the churches in Maine, appointed by their several central denominational authorities, met at Waterville. These included Baptists, Christians, Congregationalists, Friends, Free Baptists and Methodists. Other religious bodies in the state at that time were few and not strongly centered. This gathering adopted a constitution and a statement of principles, which was its platform, and organized essentially *a federation* of the Christian churches of Maine, under the title, "The Interdenominational Commission of Maine." [5] That commission has functioned continuously through the years. Its platform, which was extensively copied, sometimes with slight modifications, in other states in New England and across the country even into the far west, is worthy of record:

"1. No community, in which any denomination has any legitimate claim, should be entered by any other denomination through its official agencies without conference with the denomination or denominations having said claims.

"2. A feeble church should be revived, if possible, rather than a new one established to become its rival.

"3. The preferences of a community should always be regarded by denominational committees, missionary agents, and individual workers.

"4. Those denominations having churches nearest at hand should, other things being equal, be recognized as in the most advantageous position to encourage and aid a new enterprise in their vicinity.

---

[5] Its secretary has been Alfred Williams Anthony, who shares its initiative with President Hyde.

"5. In case one denomination begins gospel work in a destitute community it should be left to develop that work without other denominational interference.

"6. Temporary suspension of church work by any denomination occupying a field should not be deemed sufficient warrant in itself for entrance into that field by another denomination. Temporary suspension may be deemed abandonment when a church has had no preaching and held no meetings for an entire year or more.

"7. All questions of interpretation of the foregoing statements, and all cases of friction between denominations, or churches of different denominations, should be referred to some interdenominational board of arbitration, or advice."

During the years this platform has been modified and expanded to fit changing conditions but has continued at its core essentially in the original form. It was soon repeated, with minor changes, notably in New Hampshire, Vermont, New York, Michigan, Wisconsin, South Dakota, Colorado, Utah and other states.

A statement of principles, so fair, so equitable, so Christian, has not, however, brought on the millennium, nor fundamentally changed ecclesiastical habits. Reasons are not difficult to discover:—even organizations known as Christian are often self-seeking; many officials are under the domination of statistical returns because they feel obliged to report additions in numbers and organizations and increases in financial contributions, in order to hold their respective positions. Officials, new to the better ways of comity and coöperation, learn these better ways but slowly, and the painful process of "breaking in" ecclesiastical leaders new to their respective positions becomes almost continuous. Therefore progress was slow and often retarded.

Through all these years the Interdenominational Commission of Maine continued its organization and activities and maintained its integrity. Its secretary on January 15, 1918, summarized its services up to date at the annual meeting of the Home Missions Council in New York, in the following terms:

"(1) The Commission has helped the Denominational Agents to reach a mutual understanding in accordance with which the different denominations have assumed sole responsibility for Christian work in many small communities where but one church could be supported.

"(2) The Commission has assigned to different denominations spheres of influence for more intensive religious cultivation, without competition or conflict with other denominations.

"(3) Under the supervision of the Commission in three instances where manufacturing communities were developing rapidly through the utility of water power, denominations have jointly maintained religious services during the pioneer period, and then, when the denominational preferences of the settled population became known, agreed upon the definite denomination which should have charge of the developing church work in the community.

"(4) The Commission has developed a plan of reciprocal exchanges by which denominations, in giving one to another exclusive charge and responsibility in certain communities, have received in return as compensation an equal charge and responsibility in a similar community.

"(5) The Commission has made a successful experiment in home mission work by sending a 'Missionary on Wheels' into a number of sparsely settled towns to represent essential Christianity in communities too small to have prospects of ever 'adequately' supporting denominational churches.

"(6) The Commission has sat as a Court of Appeals to adjudicate the conflicting claims and interests of different churches and different denominations.

"(7) The Commission has made investigations respecting religious work amongst Foreign Speaking People in the State, and has assigned a definite responsibility for different groups to the different denominations.

"(8) The Commission has held conferences of representatives of the educational institutions of the State, the Granges, and the denominations with a view to emphasizing a common interest and mutual responsibility for social betterment.

"(9) The Commission has encouraged local surveys with the county as a unit, and with the town as a unit.

"(10) The Commission has made appeals through religious papers of wide circulation to the summer visitors who come to Maine in large numbers to cooperate with the local churches and help them maintain during the summer season the religious life, both as individuals and as churches.

"(11) During the more than twenty-seven years of its existence the Commission has published a considerable amount of helpful literature pertaining to cooperation and combination of Christian workers and churches, both in its reports, in its appeals, and in its description of special, concrete cases of successful church work and federation.

"These are the calm statements of actual facts, and with each item could be given the name of the actual towns and churches concerned—in some cases running into scores."

Not until this federal movement began was there any real study of new fields to be occupied by the churches. Today, under the so-called "Five Year Program," there has been an intensive, systematic survey of the whole country relative to over- and under-churching and overlooking. Actual accomplishment has begun. The recent coöperative organization of religious forces at Radburn, New Jersey, at Hoover Dam and Boulder City are prophetic. Some denominational assemblies have instructed their home mission boards not to give aid to churches in competitive fields. Proposals are also now under consideration to transfer certain types of denominational service to the interdenominational bodies.

While, due to various causes, the fact that many of the churches concerned were planned many years ago, and the continued persistence of denominational consciousness, there is still a work ahead in the establishment of comity, if we consider the situation in a survey of the entire country, the growth of this principle has been really remarkable and we have an entirely new state of mind on the part of home mission bodies relating to home mission territory and on the part of church councils and federations in our cities. This subject has been adequately set forth in the recent volume, "Church Comity," by H. Paul Douglass.

The word "comity" is indicative of a spirit of unity rather than its practice, but the spirit has been and is rapidly being translated into action. The speedy growth of cities, with their extending suburbs, and the transition of churches from business areas to these suburbs, constantly raised the problem of church distribution, to adjust itself to the continuous redistribution of populations. Comity is concerned thus with the relocation of churches as well as with the creation and location of new churches in newly populated areas.

Thus comity is becoming a major concern in the city federations of churches. It involves surveys of new areas, the proposed organization of new churches, the location and purchase of church sites, the organization of Sunday schools which often precede churches, the creation and location of branch churches or missions, and now even includes the selection of locations for outdoor preaching. Many other questions appear under this heading—the merger of two churches either of the same denomination or, at times, of different denominations; sometimes the transfer of churches from one denomination to another; and in cosmopolitan cities it includes special work for foreign-speaking groups. Comity is thus coöperation in the extension of religious institutions in contrast to the unfortunate competition in such distribution which existed half a century ago.

The same coöperative effort now obtains among the home mission boards through the Home Missions Council, in the distribution or redistribution of territory among the several denominations. The early surveys made by the Committee on Home Missions of the Federal Council in the home mission states and by its Commission on Country Life in[6] rural areas of the East and Middle West, revealed sad conditions of duplication, neglect and profligacy in the expenditure of home mission funds.[7] Comity in the home mission fields is simply a modern religious statesmanship.[8]

EVANGELISM AND LIFE SERVICE

Several of these areas of service are administered by commissions or departments of the Federal Council, whose executive staff has grown to considerable proportions. To have carried out these varied tasks by as many organizations, would, however, have involved a very much larger personnel.[9]

While from the very beginning the movement for federal unity found certain areas in the work of the churches which were fixed, determined, and which were somewhat identified with denominational principles or policies, there are two of these areas in which unity of consultation and action has a most encouraging record. The first of these is the field of evangelism.[10] While evangelism and the attitude toward it has differed among the several bodies, it will be remembered that in the life of the churches of twenty-five to fifty years ago they found themselves occasionally uniting in evangelistic campaigns under highly gifted itinerant leaders. During the past twenty-five years, however, the so-called professional evangelism, which succeeded to that of such earlier leaders as Finney and Moody and differed greatly from it, has been somewhat on the wane. The question was asked why the pastors should not be their own evangelists? Thus there have been two trends in the American churches, one more individualistic in pastoral evangelism and the other looking toward a form of unity in evangelism which could make place for the united evangelistic impact of the pastors. This has become known as simultaneous evangelism.[11] It has expressed itself through the Federal Council, which has brought the evangelistic secretaries of the several denominations together to go about the country in a unified appeal and in the departments on evangelism of the local federations and councils, to make permanent and continuous the movement carried out through the Federal Council.

---

[6] The pioneer work of Charles O. Gill and Edmund de S. Brunner in surveys of the rural field, was largely responsible for the later development of church comity.

[7] "The Country Church" by Charles O. Gill and Gifford Pinchot. Macmillan, 1913. "Six Thousand Country Churches" by Charles O. Gill and Gifford Pinchot. Macmillan, 1919.

[8] Executively Rev. W. R. King, Secretary of the Home Missions Council, is exercising it to a high degree. Likewise Anne Seesholtz and her associates of the Council of Women.

[9] To the inner administration of the Council wise and generous service and direction was rendered for twenty years by Caroline W. Chase.

[10] Charles L. Goodell, and more recently Jesse M. Bader have exercised leadership with rare singleness of purpose, over the entire nation.

A common program has been developed and to a very large extent common literature is used. The Weeks of Prayer in January and Easter week bring all the churches into unison and the Fellowship of Prayer during the Lenten season is both unitedly and widely observed to such an extent that many daily papers print the daily program throughout the season.[12] Thus in the one mission of the church which has stood out as its main function from the beginning we find the several bodies ready and able to unite. This change of method has brought about another interesting phenomenon. Up to recent times certain church bodies like the Protestant Episcopal and the Lutheran have been unsympathetic toward evangelism as previously conceived by the other church bodies, but this newer form of unified evangelism has brought about considerable change in these two communions, more particularly perhaps in the Protestant Episcopal Church, which now has its official department of Evangelism.

---

[11] The spirit and motive of coöperative evangelism is finely set forth in many volumes by Rev. Charles L. Goodell.

[12] The Fellowship of Prayer is prepared by the Congregational Commission and made available, through the Federal Council, for all the churches, an illustration of a method which might be more generally followed.

Worship and Devotional Life

More recently a Committee on Worship has been instituted by the Federal Council, to bring the churches together in the interest, not only of public worship, but of the cultivation of the devotional life, in which there is just now a new and deeply needed interest. As we shall see later on, this area of coöperative service is likely to become of the utmost significance in determining the course of the larger movement for unity.

Christian Education

Another field of action which might have been considered one of the most difficult in which to bring about united operation is the field of religious education.[13] As we have seen, one of the first of the voluntary movements for unity was that of Sunday school forces, and one of the earliest of the organizations to hold world-wide conferences was the World's Sunday School Association.[14] The Sunday school lessons have for many years been coöperatively prepared.

After the movement for federal unity had gained the consciousness of the churches, the several denominational organizations concerned particularly with the Sunday school came together in the Sunday School Council of Evangelical Denominations, organized at Philadelphia in 1910. Meanwhile a voluntary organization of Sunday school workers, the International Sunday School Association, had extended its influence throughout the country in local organizations. In 1922 these bodies united in the International Council of Religious Education,[15] so that today religious education has become, as it should be, a major object of Christian unity.

---

[13] Benjamin S. Winchester has rendered preëminent service in this field.

[14] Robert M. Hopkins, Executive Secretary in America.

The Council of Church Boards of Education[16] unites the educational work of the churches in colleges and universities. The Missionary Education Movement prepares literature for education in home and foreign missions.

The International Council of Religious Education has, in its development, paralleled the Federal Council. The reader will be deeply impressed by a recent volume,[17] which, while dealing with the subject in its community relationships, is an epitome of almost nation-wide coöperation in education.

The Federal Council, in most of its departments, is broadly educational and, in addition to its coöperative relationships with other organizations, has a Department of Research and Education.[18]

SOCIAL SERVICE: INDUSTRY

There were, however, new forces at work in human life which, as we have seen, were impulsions toward the organization of the Federal Council. Thus new areas of service were opening up before the churches in the field of social and industrial affairs, race relations, and later in the movement for world peace. Here no questions of a denominational nature could be divisive. There have been differences of opinion in the matter of emphasis on individual and social salvation, but these were within denominations rather than between them.

Thus, because of their deep and wide human interests, those departments of the Federal Council dealing with these great human problems have stood out in a preëminent way. The so-called Social Creed of the Churches was the first coherent expression of the churches in this field.

---

[15] Hugh S. Magill, General Secretary.

[16] Robert L. Kelly, Executive Secretary.

[17] "Community Organization in Religious Education" by Hugh Hartshorne and J. Q. Miller. Yale Univ. Press, 1932.

[18] A good example of scientific research is the "International Survey of the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations," for which F. Ernest Johnson of the Federal Council was chief consultant.

The Federal Council Commission on the Church and Social Service, first of all, was the means of opening up this area of service to the churches. Previous to its organization in 1908 only one denomination, namely the Presbyterian under Charles Stelzle's leadership,[19] had any organized department dealing with social problems, whereas today practically all communions affiliated with the Council have church departments of greater or lesser magnitude represented in the Federal Council Commission. The churches, until recently, had little coöperative contact with the national and community agencies for social work and gave them little moral and spiritual support, such as is now revealed in the Church Conference on Social Work,[20] which meets annually with the National Conference of Social Work, as an associated group. When we look at this area of federal unity the problems in which these churches are brought into united council and action are impressive. The Commission on Social Service has sought to unite the social relations of the constituent bodies of the Federal Council in a concerted program of their own formulation, which leaves to them great initiative, and which depends for effectiveness on their powerful action or communion. The Commission began many years ago to secure understanding confidence between the church and organized labor in common efforts for the rights and welfare of the working people of the nation; at the same time to have effective contacts with industry, and to press the Christian motive into industrial control. The Commission has also given attention to social insurance for protecting the workers against unemployment, accident, sickness and old age. The Annual Labor Sunday Message has become a feature of every Labor Day celebration. The Industrial Secretary keeps in contact with major industrial situations where he is active in the investigation of conditions, mediation and relief.[21] A rounded program on relief and prevention of unemployment and relief and rehabilitation in the coal areas has been a special concern. The churches played a notable part in the abolition of the twelve-hour day in the steel industry.

---

[19] Charles Stelzle is the outstanding pioneer in this realm.

[20] The organization of this annual conference, under the wise leadership of Worth M. Tippy, in 1930, was a most important event in the interest of both agencies.

The most recent development of the Federal Council's Commission on Social Service, which again is a coöperative effort between the Council and church boards of religious education and social action, is in the field of marriage and family life.[22] Within four years an impressive program, aiming to exert the great educational influence of the churches for happier and more Christian homes, has been developed and financed.

RACE RELATIONS

In the United States the question of race relationships, particularly that between the White and Negro groups and between Caucasians and American Indians, constitutes a serious problem for the churches.[23] In the Federal Council four of the great bodies of Negro churches are on a basis of equal membership with the other constituent bodies of the Council and they are privileged to bring their problems and protests to it. Here again is a field where denominational principles do not enter in, although, of course, it should be noted that the white bodies of the North and of the South differ in their consideration of the practical aspects of the problem. The bringing together in local communities and in national conferences of the leaders among the white and colored populations is a task big enough to make a body like the Federal Council worth while, if it did nothing else.

---

[21] "Religion Lends a Hand" by James Myers. Harpers, 1929. An illustration of the devoted service of the Industrial Secretary.

[22] This service has assumed such proportions, that Prof. L. Foster Wood has been released from Rochester-Colgate Seminary to give his entire time to it.

[23] George E. Haynes, a Negro secretary of the Federal Council has written several informative and stimulating volumes. Women have found their place in this work, under the executive direction of Katherine Gardner.

INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE AND GOOD WILL

Up to the time of the organization of the Council, the churches had taken almost no explicit attitude on the question of war,[24] if we except the Quakers and other bodies of conscientious objectors. The church bodies and the churches up to that time had assumed war as a necessary evil. It was pretty much a question in their minds as to which nation, in the case of war, had the most just cause, and perhaps that was not always raised.

At the Interchurch Conference in 1905 one of the most significant utterances was that of Chief Justice David J. Brewer, who set forth, as one of the objectives of the new body, the cause of world peace, and at the meeting of the Federal Council in 1908 another noted lawyer, Judge Henry Wade Rogers, proposed what was perhaps the first utterance[25] of any unified Christian body on the sin of war and the duty of seeking methods of arbitration.

Interestingly enough, the inception of the movement which is now represented in the Commission on International Justice and Goodwill came also from abroad. Shortly before the World War a group of pastors and laymen in Great Britain and Germany had been meeting together, largely due, of course, to the feeling of apprehensiveness in Christian men in both of these countries. In 1911 the General Secretary of the Federal Council, who was the guest at that time in London of the Rev. F. B. Meyer, Honorary Secretary of the Free Church Council of Great Britain, was invited to come to Berlin, and, while there, was asked to convey to the new Federal Council in the United States an invitation to join in these friendly conversations between German and English churchmen, and to participate in a conference which was to have been held in Berlin in 1912. But all of this came just a bit too late, and, while a much larger conference did convene at Constance in 1914, it also was just too late to be of any influence for peace at that time.[26]

---

[24] The common current phrase "a warless world" was first used by Sidney L. Gulick, Secretary of the Federal Council, who has written several stimulating volumes setting forth this new mission of the churches, and Walter W. Van Kirk, his associate, has also produced several volumes of striking interest.

[25] "Federal Council of the Churches." E. B. Sanford. Pages 296 ff. The Revell Press, 1909.

As the result of these overtures, however, the Federal Council Commission on Peace and Arbitration was organized in 1911. So far as the writer can recall, none of the constituent denominations of the Council had any department, commission or standing committee in the interest of world peace, with the exception of the Five Year Meeting of the Friends. Today practically all of these bodies have such departments, some of them highly organized, which unite in the Federal Council Commission. There are now twenty-one denominational peace organizations and forty or more associated with local councils of churches, coöperating with the Federal Council Commission on International Justice and Goodwill and also with such voluntary bodies as the Church Peace Union and the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches. Several annual study conferences of the churches have been held. That the Federal Council and associated agencies have been effective in molding and mobilizing public opinion to a high degree there is no question, in support of such interests as the World Court, Limitation of Armaments, and the Briand-Kellogg Pact of Paris.[27]

---

[26] "The Churches of Christ in America" by Charles S. Macfarland. Church Peace Union, 1914, gives the record of the church bodies on peace and war up to that date.

No educational movement of the churches has made greater progress than this, since the World War. This has been especially true in regard to children. The Committee on World Friendship among Children [28] has created good will, not only among the children, but between peoples, by its projects with Japan, Mexico, the Philippines, Porto Rico and China.

It should be noted that in the development and organization of these new great areas of service, brought to the door of the churches in the course of human events, the federated forces of the churches have exercised leadership, have become creative and constructive factors among the denominations themselves and have largely influenced the popular mind.

HOSTILE FORCES

It was not to be expected, of course, that any movement of such significance and potentiality would find an easy road in human affairs. Forces of reaction, and, in other cases, selfish interests, have been arrayed against the churches in these fields. Narrow and backward-looking leaders of industry, as we have seen, have persistently and bitterly opposed the social program of the churches as expressed in the Federal Council. In certain areas the attempt to bring black and white men and women into brotherhood and human coöperation has been resented. Those who are still committed either to the desirableness or necessity of the war system of the world have been militant, and, it may be said, militaristic in their attacks on the movement of the churches for international peace. The fact that the Federal Council has been the means of developing this leadership of the churches in these fields has naturally made it the main object of these attacks.

---

[27] The world movement of the churches for peace is described in "*Die Kirchen und der Friede.*" Adolf Keller, 1927.

[28] Developed largely through the earnest service of Jeannette W. Emrich.

While, as has been said, the line of least resistance has been followed in the search for unity, the opposite has been true in these objectives of the Federal Council.

It took more than fifteen years of persistent appeal to induce the steel industry to abandon the twelve-hour day and the seven-day week, beginning with the Council's report on the Bethlehem steel strike in 1910.[29] Officials in this industry, it is sad to relate, distributed documents so carefully worded by their lawyers as to escape libel, containing falsehoods regarding the Federal Council and its officers. In one case the Adjutant-General of a state threateningly demanded the suppression of a proposed report by the Council on industrial conditions in his state. The Council and its representatives have been attacked by admirals and major-generals, in one or two cases by congressmen, by secretaries of industrial organizations, by narrow patriotic organizations of women. Concerted efforts have been made to cut off the base of financial support. Books have been written and widely distributed containing many falsities, but sponsored by little groups of reactionary men.

These agencies have employed spies, built up secret organizations, bribed stenographers, and have at times stooped to other discreditable methods, in the hope of weakening the influence of the churches in progressive measures to which they are either conscientiously opposed or which affect personal or commercial interests. But this is not the place for the telling of that story. Perhaps some day the writer will find opportunity to relate it in full. Suffice it to say that there are none of these attacks which have been put in printed form which are not replete with falsehoods and false implications. It may be said that the effect on the movement for federal unity, and especially on the Federal Council as an organization, has for the most part either been negligible or the motives and methods of these assaults have been so obvious that they have brought moral support to the Council.

---

[29] The story of this struggle between religion and corporate wealth would make an interesting volume in itself.

Other Areas of Service

There have been many other areas of service included in the practice of federal unity which need not be described, including the trusteeship and nurture of union churches in the Canal Zone, the interests of promotional administration through the United Stewardship Council of the Churches of Christ of the United States and Canada, such obvious service as that of providing and assisting the chaplains in the army and navy, the provision for the spreading of the gospel by the new agency of the radio, the promotion of the religious press and the cultivation of church architecture. To these might be added almost numberless tasks which it would be absolutely impossible to carry out by purely denominational procedure.

As has been already stated, united church assistance to the American Red Cross, through the Federal Council Committee on Mercy and Relief, to the American Relief Administration, to famine and flood relief in China and Russia, to war relief for Europe, has been more or less constant. Coöperation with the government in such matters as child welfare and unemployment has been effective from time to time.

Historic occasions have been observed as they arose, such as the provision of exhibits at the Panama-Pacific and Philadelphia expositions, the recognition of such anniversaries as those of Luther and Whitefield, the Mayflower Tercentenary and the Huguenot-Walloon Tercentenary. A multitude of these incidental tasks have been performed and could have been adequately cared for only by a united body.

Without attempting any kind of ecclesiastical procedure or formal organization, the general spirit of friendliness and of coöperation in human affairs of Jews and Christians[30] has been encouraged. Often when issues of mutual importance to the people as a whole have arisen in social and industrial life there has been coöperation between the Federal Council, the National Catholic Welfare Council and the Conference of Jewish Rabbis.

---

[30] The outstanding national leader of this movement is Everett R. Clinchy.

It is by no means inappropriate to record the influence of this unified service in the principle of stewardship[31] which will be fully treated in a later chapter. Men and women, by their very giving, have gained larger vision of the mission of the Christian church. The obvious economy of realizing these great objectives through one body rather than entirely through twenty-five or thirty separate budgets, is in itself, a worthy objective.

Underlying all of this practical service there has been the need of coöperative thinking and study of the large human interests involved. This has led to the development of a Department of Research and Education,[32] issuing a weekly information service on great human issues, particularly for ministers and leaders of religious life, and preparing authoritative reports on social and industrial conditions. The director of this department has recently completed a world-wide survey of the foreign work of the Young Men's Christian Association and the Young Women's Christian Association made by request of these bodies. Thus the Federal Council has attempted to carry out the unified work of the churches, not only with earnestness of spirit and fearlessness, but also with consecrated intelligence, a quality which has been at times sadly wanting in the church.

RELATIONS ABROAD

Looking toward the international federal movement, we shall find the same courses followed and the same areas of service gradually occupied in the Universal Christian Council on Life and Work through its Department of Education and Extension and its Department of Research and through the similar department of the International Missionary Council at Geneva. The Federal Council Commission on Relations with Churches Abroad is the American Section of the Universal Christian Council[33] and the several departments of the Federal Council are thus in touch with similar interests in other parts of the world.

---

[31] For the Federal Council this greatly needed service is cared for, with conscientious devotion, by Charles C. Cole and William E. Woolsey, under a Board of Finance of business men.

[32] See "The Social Work of the Churches," by F. Ernest Johnson, and other authoritative publications by him and his associate, Benson Y. Landis.

LOCAL AREAS

The State and Local Councils of Churches are occupied with much the same areas of service; community surveys, distribution of responsibility in comity arrangements and practically all of the interests cared for nationally by the Federal Council. The local programs necessarily vary according to the type of community and its problems.[34]

As one looks over the whole field of religious service in which the churches are now unified and looks back a quarter of a century, it is not too much to say that probably no movement of modern times has made any such progress as that of the churches in unifying their forces in a constantly widening area and with constantly increasing effectiveness. One can perhaps best appraise this, in the light of statesmanship, by attempting to imagine this service if attempted independently by all these denominational bodies.[35]

---

[33] Rev. Henry S. Leiper, formerly a foreign missionary, has executive direction of this body.

[34] Rev. Roy B. Guild has executed this task nationally for twenty years with rare sympathy and wisdom, in association with a group of local executives, many of whom have rendered preëminent service, notably Rev. Orlo J. Price, of Rochester, New York, recently retired, who has been a strong personal factor in bringing the national and local bodies into closer relationship.

[35] Adolf Keller, who has seen much of the churches in the United States, interprets them from the viewpoint of a European in his volume *"Dynamis; Formen und Kräfte des amerikanischen Protestantismus,"* 1922.

CHAPTER VIII

THE MOVEMENT FOR ORGANIC UNION

We now come to consider a movement for Christian unity quite different in its approach, its method, its emphases, to some extent its objective, and, indeed, varying somewhat in its spirit. While many of its leading personalities are identical with those in the federal movement, it also differs considerably in the temperaments of its more earnest proponents.

The federal movement took little account of traditions and of certain of the historical processes which have brought us where we are. It left creeds and confessions, theories of ministry and sacraments, matters of polity and organization and forms of worship with each of the federated bodies. The proposal for organic union, on the contrary, has raised questions of so-called faith and order which take us back to the beginning of Christianity, if not almost to the beginning of religious institutions. There has been the assumption that the Christians not only could, but if they were to be united must do so on identity of doctrine and forms of expressing Christian faith. Moreover, the conference to be described in this chapter, attempted to do this while in session.

The main difference, perhaps, between the two movements is that the one begins by uniting the churches on the things they have in common; the other starts out with the consideration and discussion of long-standing differences. The one is objective, the other subjective; the one is occupied mainly with what the institution is to do with human life, the other is concerned equally, if not sometimes more, with the institution itself.

The advocates of organic union for the most part, at least in theory, envisage the immediate or early possibility, assumed to be desirable, of one church, under one government, to the extent of a common center of some kind, on the basis of an identical creed—and the same or similar conception of the nature of the church and ministry and of the sacraments, although there is wide variation among these leaders as to how far these matters should be identical.

While not concerned with matters of "faith" in the sense of intellectual belief, the federal movement was, above all, founded on faith in the larger sense of the word. It began in a spirit of trustful confidence in one another of its constituent bodies. On the other hand, it will be seen that the movement for so-called organic union was embarrassed from the beginning, by at least touches of distrust and doubt. As one of the French members observed to the writer, the constituency of the conference was not sufficiently *sympathique,* using a French term which has a very spiritual meaning.

Here again there are several voluntary or subsidiary organizations, some associated, in the United States, with the Protestant Episcopal Church and one with the Disciples of Christ. It is not necessary to burden this volume with the multitude of conferences on unity that have been held nor with the many pronouncements by bodies of Christians in various parts of the world, many of them in response to the Lambeth Conference appeal of 1920. They are evidences, however, of the state of mind of the churches, which is favorable to unity—of some kind.[1] Some of the voluntary organizations or conference groups in the United States have at times encouraged the violation of ecclesiastical and constitutional rules and have occasionally wrought division instead of unity. Little is gained for the cause of unity by aggravating the differences between parties or schools within a denominational body, by publicly violating religious or ecclesiastical principles which are matters of conscience. Defiant antinomian efforts and attempts at force do not hasten the larger objective. Whatever value there may be in this method, it should at least be sparingly employed.

---

[1] See "Documents on Christian Unity," by G. K. A. Bell, Oxford University Press.

There is one body which includes official representatives of the churches, the World Conference on Faith and Order, which from the first has envisaged the inclusion of the Roman Catholic Church as the ultimate essential to its aim, or at least as a hoped-for possibility. For a considerable period this movement kept itself entirely distinct from that for federal unity and, indeed, many of its proponents have been hostile toward federation, first, because of their feeling that the lesser good might preclude or delay the greater, but in many cases because they were unwilling to consider any form of unity that did not embrace the Roman Catholic Church, or one that might be what they fearfully term "Pan-Protestant."

THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER

Following several more or less preliminary conferences[2] over a period of about seventeen years, the World Conference on Faith and Order met with an imposing representative gathering of church leaders at Lausanne in 1927, most of whom had been officially appointed. While for the most part this meeting was regarded as more or less disappointing, its records constitute a real contribution to our knowledge, at least of the problems involved. Its evident unity upon the message of the Christian church to the world was of great moment. But there were some grievous errors and unfortunate procedures at Lausanne. It approached dangerously near the old polemics at times. The apparent assumption that the conference would unite, almost to begin with, on the Nicene Creed as an expression of common doctrine was not so obvious as was thought. The members of the Eastern or Greek Orthodox churches knew perfectly well that acceptance of the Nicene Creed did not mean the same thing, intellectually at least, to modernist or even mediating Western churchmen as it did to them and they regarded the proposal as not entirely ingenuous. Unfortunately, the conference thus became at least somewhat tinged with the atmosphere of suspicion.

---

[2] The most important preparatory conference was held at Geneva in 1920, immediately following the similar meeting which initiated the Stockholm conference on Life and Work, held in 1925.

On the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, or rather, the intellectualizing of this sacred mystery, they were so completely divided that they felt obliged to defer discussion of it and its implications in the realm of order. This reminds one of the second Council of Nicea where the doctrine of the Holy Spirit had to be evaded for similar reasons.

As to the creeds, the Eastern churches (for they are not one) demanded compliance on what is termed "the totality of faith," implying complete agreement with their standards and yet their several autocephalous churches appeared to have no common inclusive formula, and while many Anglicans doubtless agree with the Orthodox position, they too are unable to tell what the totality of faith is. The recent dispute over the Prayer Book in England is a case in point. Thus to imply total agreement with something undefined constituted an embarrassing situation, especially when it was urged as if it had algebraic exactitude, and there was something about it all that seemed artificial. There was a considerable element of those known as Anglo-Catholics and it is somewhat generally felt that their attitude precluded substantial progress by the conference. There was not the complete absence of acrimony, personal and otherwise, that needs to characterize such a gathering. There was a bit too much keen-wittedness.

Indeed, in answer to the action taken recently by the Continuation Committee of this conference, proposing a second conference, one of the influential Free Church papers in Great Britain has expressed the immature and unwise judgment that the proposal should be abandoned. While the really valuable contributions of the Lausanne meeting have thus been obscured by considerable vain discussion, both at the conference and following it, there was undoubted value in making differences known and better understood. There was probably the unanimous judgment that this road toward organic unity was much longer than many earnest spirits had thought. Perhaps the most significant, although rather belated, action of the conference was its recognition of the value of the coöperative and federated movements.

This action of the Continuation Committee of the Lausanne Conference as submitted to the churches in December, 1927, is so enlightening that it should be quoted in full:

> "As the individual disciple is known by his fruits, so the unity of the disciples is shown by their fellowship in the service of the Master. Report V declares that, 'pending the solution of the questions of faith and order in which agreements have not yet been reached, it is possible for us, not simply as individuals but as churches, to unite in the activities of brotherly service which Christ has committed to His disciples'; but there is difference as to the exact form this cooperation should take.
>
> "In his Encyclical Letter of 1920, the Ecumenical Patriarch proposed 'that a league or council of the churches should be formed for practical purposes.' It has been suggested that such a council might be evolved from already existing organizations, such as the Continuation Committee on Life and Work, consisting of representatives officially appointed by almost all the Christian communions, and other organizations of similar nature. Some of us believe that such a council if formed should include, as its two branches, questions of life and work and of faith and order. Others believe that, for the present, it would be wiser for the movements represented by Stockholm and Lausanne to develop in

independence, each following its own way; but there is general agreement that ultimately life, work, faith and order are expressions of an existing spiritual unity, and that each requires the other for its complete fruition. 'We therefore commend to our Churches the consideration of the steps which may be immediately practicable to bring our existing unity in service to more effective expression' (Report V).

"As material for such consideration, the following suggestions which it was impossible adequately to discuss at Lausanne are passed on to the churches:

"1. In preparation for closer fellowship, each communion should seek more intimate knowledge of the faith and life, worship and order of the others. Differences which are the outgrowth of complicated historical developments, may preserve some aspect of truth or of life which is of value to the church as a whole, or they may sometimes prove to be less important than they are supposed to be. As the different communions come to know one another better they will grow in understanding and in appreciation of one another.

"2. It has not been possible for the Conference to consider with the care which it deserves the relation of the existing churches to one another or the place which each or any of them may hold in the undivided church. We commend to the churches the suggestions which have been made on this subject in the addresses delivered at the Conference. In the meantime, we welcome the movement already under way for the union of bodies of similar doctrine, polity and worship, and trust that it may continue with ever greater success.

"3. Pending the complete, organic union of the different churches, we note with satisfaction a number of movements for practical cooperation along social, evangelistic and other lines. Experience shows that it has been possible for widely separate bodies to cooperate in such movements with mutual profit and without surrender of principle. (See the appended 'Notes to Section IV,' Note A.) There is abundant evidence that when communions undertake together the divine task of bringing the love of Christ to those who do not know Him, they become closer to one another. Especially we commend to the churches the consideration of what steps can be taken to eliminate needless overlapping and competition in the local community; that in ways consistent with the genius of the several communions, our existing unity in Christ may be manifest to the world. (See the appended 'Notes to Section IV,' Note B.)

"We note with gratitude to God the recent increase of effective cooperation in the mission field. The purpose of all missionary work is to carry the eternal Gospel to the ends of the earth, so that it may meet the spiritual needs of every nation and bring all men to the Savior. Here more than anywhere else unity is essential. We note with sympathy the degree of union which has already been attained in many countries and the plans which are proposed for further union. We commend these plans to the churches for their careful consideration.

"The demand which comes from the churches of the Mission field is that the Churches at home should grant them greater freedom of action, and that their hopes of unity should not be frustrated by the long-continued acquiescence in disunion at home which makes it difficult to recognize how fatal disunion is to the new indigenous churches."

The following note was added to this report:

"A. There are some who believe that cooperation should take the form of federation, either local, national, or international; others oppose federation, fearing that it may become a substitute for complete organic union. In the interest of clarity of thought it is important to remember that the word 'federation' is used in at least three different senses. It may denote either

1. A substitute for organic union,
2. A step on the road to organic union,
3. A form of organic union.

In discussing federation it is important to make clear in which of these different senses the word is used.

"B. It is suggested that in the case of communions of similar doctrine and polity, the desired expression of unity may often be secured by the method of denominational comity. In the case of those communions which are separated by fundamental differences of view; the problem is more difficult and will require special consideration."

This was in effect an adoption of the principle contained in the preamble to the plan of federation of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and that of other similar federated bodies in Europe and the mission field, and its wider application in the Universal Christian Council on Life and Work and the International Missionary Council. When we consider that previously this movement had at times been almost and even directly obstructive to the progress of federal unity, this action is of high import for the future.

As to the assumption of the proponents for immediate organic unity that federal unity is obstructive to what they deem to be the larger end to be gained, it may be noted that, so far as the United States is concerned, there is little indication of any such influence. Organic unity or union is both seeking and finding its way by the uniting of family and other homogeneous denominations, such as the union of Baptists and Free Baptists in 1911 and the recent union of the Congregational and Christian Churches. These families of churches are seeking their way through organized conference and occasional unity of action, both national and international. In parts of the world where the problem is simpler than in the United States organic union is taking place, as in Canada and Scotland. In the foreign mission field there have been recent striking instances of substantial union, in South India, Persia, China, Porto Rico and other areas, well worthy of study. Thus the two forms of unity, federal and organic, are drawing together by natural and normal processes.

We have already traced the history of organic union through the period of the ancient church and have described the modern movement resulting in the Lausanne Conference of 1927. We must now consider, with humility of spirit and sympathy, but also with frankness, the lessons from the Lausanne Conference.

Lessons from the Lausanne Conference

Here was really a recurrence to the early ecumenical councils of the church so far as the objects are concerned, although in a very different spirit from that of the ancient councils.

There are those who feel that the movement for federal unity means the disparagement and the ultimate loss of the significance of our confessions of faith. It is interesting, however, to note the essential unity in the Federal Council between men known as modernists and those who are known as conservatives, excluding, of course, the violent extremes in both directions. While the simple preamble of the Federal Council may not be adequate as a universal expression of Christian faith, we might perhaps start from that basis and build upward rather than to take the ancient expressions of intellectual doctrine and analyze them downward, as was attempted at Lausanne.

Lausanne was just a bit too replete with Greek and Latin, with the resultant conceptions and implications, for the average Christian man or woman. It is the soul that wants the Father, the heart that wants the Son, and the human spirit that wants the Holy Ghost. And when men try to express in terms of intellect those things that may only be spiritually discerned, it is seeking to express the inexpressible and the effort becomes a kind of rationalism. Then, they are ever bound to differ upon the very things in which they are at one. As a matter of fact, our existing unity has been an undefined expression of faith in God the Father, Christ the Lord and Master, and the Holy Spirit. It has not, as some may think, been simply doing things together even when we thought it was.

Or, if one prefers a reverse process to that of the Federal Council preamble, attention has already been called to a monumental German production of twenty mammoth volumes, called "Corpus Confessionum," setting forth all the creeds and confessions of Christendom. We might take those articles of faith and belief common to them all as our symbol of unity, permitting all Christians in our union to use as much of all of them as they find to their edification. Indeed, almost any creed is subject to general acceptance, when the individual is permitted to interpret it.

Another question sometimes raised is whether or not federal unity or union injures the spiritual influence of the ordinances of Christianity. Here again the situation is clarifying and we are discovering the difference between the form and the spirit of these expressions of religion and that there may be many forms of one spirit. And yet at Lausanne, while each accepted all others as followers of Christ and declared their spiritual unity in a common message to the world and interpreted the Sacrament as the sign of this invisible grace, they allowed the most highly speculative theories to prevent them from observing it even in separated groups simultaneously, and it became a symbol of division greater than that of the creeds that determined its theories. This invisible grace must ever defy scientific analysis and philosophic speculation, and it surely may be partaken in reality and unity by many souls of many minds if men will but receive it with the simplicity in which it came to the disciples.

We may discern, however, a new orientation among nearly all our religious bodies. It corresponds to a finer human mood. It is something very different from the emotions of evangelism on the one hand and the intellectualism of creeds upon the other. It is the desire, deep in men's hearts for a new perception of the devotional life, the giving up of one's self in a true and reasonable mysticism, to a sense of the Infinite. It is not only in forms of worship, although these have their place in it.

Lausanne assumed that somewhere, at some point, by some of the early fathers, the last word had been spoken, if they could only find the spot. But the fact is the last word was not spoken yesterday and will not be today. It is a vain search.

We need not seek some irreducible minimum. Rather let us have all the creeds, for all the light they give, but let us not call them "faith." Let theology remain the queen of sciences, but perhaps the noblest achievement of the human intellect is the realization of its fallibility and frailty. The sovereign attainment of the mind of man is intellectual humility in the presence of divine reality. Whenever Christian faith has been made to conform to and has been embodied in a philosophy, it has lost in spiritual content. Heart and mind have never accorded well. It has been a surrender to "the world," involving a compromise in which the spirit has lost. Sectarianism has often been the result. Religion cannot be identified with a "culture" without serious loss.

There is something not to be found in either the ancient or the modern creeds. It does not need the elucidation of the ante-mundane generation of the hypostatic *logos* on the one hand, and it is not a social creed of the churches on the other. It may express itself by many sacramental forms. It may be shared by wise or ignorant alike. It is not easily defined. Some of our devout leaders of science seem to be looking toward it rather than to the theologians for the reconciling of science and religion. It is the life of the spirit in the search for a sense of the reality of God as revealed in the face of Jesus Christ. Lausanne was really misnamed, for what they sought was something other than the "faith" of Jesus. The leadership of this new reformation does not call so much for a Luther or a Calvin or a Melanchthon, but for a few evangelical fishermen; for except as we become as little children we may not enter the Kingdom of Heaven. We miss some subjects in the Lausanne agenda: the Meaning of Prayer, Repentance for Sin, the Ministry of Sorrow, Spiritual Pride, the Meaning of the Cross in Human Life, the Danger of Pharasaism. We might try another conference on personal religion, where disciples would gather to hear what Jesus said and feel as Jesus felt, for before the end of such a convocation they would, it may be hoped, receive the Sacrament together on these grounds of spiritual unity.

If there is to be another Lausanne let it be one in which men worship together, using those forms which they now have sufficiently in common; commune together upon the spiritual experience of their human lives, or, better still, let Lausanne and Stockholm meet together, when the right time comes, using the simple scriptural language of human experience and emotion, and see if we may thus discover the common faith which no creed of yesterday or today can adequately express. We want something to express love and trust, as these do not and never can. Instead of following Newman in his "grammar of assent," let us follow him in "Lead, Kindly Light." Indeed, the hymns of the church constitute her expressions of faith infinitely better than the creeds of her councils. We are searching for the faith that is greater than belief, as the symbol and bond of unity. Lausanne was a sort of academy of theology, philosophy and science, rather than a discipleship of faith. It must be remembered that the great body of Christians to be united are not bishops or theologians, but just plain simple Christians.

We shall not reach unity of faith by discussing *filioque* and *homoousion* with the Patriarch of Constantinople or unity of order by debating *su ei Petros* with the Anglo-Catholic or Anglican, or the difference between *ex opere operato* and *sola fide* with the Committee of Archbishops, or by reasoning on *hoc est corpus meum* with the Lutheran. For we too often obscure the deepest realities when we apply intellectual words to spiritual things. But, perhaps, after we have united with the disciples and among ourselves with the Master in washing one another's feet long enough, we shall find some common symbol that will express our faith and one which may be spoken in simple language and in many forms by our poor feeble minds. Dr. Johnson once said to Boswell, "We all know what light is but it is not easy to tell what it is." Peradventure, if we climb together to the mountain of transfiguration with the Master and then descend with him to the plain of human life, we may find worship and service a better designation than either belief and order or life and work. Oneness of spiritual experience (that is faith) and unity of service we are ready for today. Identity or uniformity, whether intellectual (miscalled faith) or in objective form in what we call order, would reverse the process of evolution and we should simply revert to a primordial homogeneity only possible by our abode at Rome. In the Father's house there must be many mansions. This state of mind and heart is far more likely to save the church from distracting ecclesiasticism and dogmatism, on the one hand, and a detached and deranged humanism on the other, than unity upon the Nicene Creed, and it is a matter of certitude that neither of these can ever save the other from going wrong. It is of interest to note that the so-called liberals at and since Lausanne have deplored the excess of return to ancient conceptions, while the conservatives feel that too much was conceded.

All this was really in the hearts of the men and women at Lausanne without becoming clearly or definedly articulate. The message of the conference reveals this. Most significantly it appeared in the addresses. Bishop Brent, in his opening appeal, earnestly declared that "we dare not be exclusive in sacramental, in mystical, or in intellectual modes of approach." As one church historian reminded the conference, in the ancient councils unity was never complete. Another member urged that the Christian message is to the affections and will. It was felt that to assume a cessation of the influence of the Holy Spirit with any council was to leave us "comfortless" and that the theory of an errorless council was not altogether unlike that of an errorless pope. There was a reminder that agreement in thought might not imply the deeper unity of souls. It was modestly suggested by one member that they might find "unity in the realm of experience."

Perhaps of most significance is the fact that in many addresses the distinction between faith and belief was alluded to. A German urged that acceptance of a creed did not mean the dogmatic form of it, but the religious convictions it sought to express. Many others distinguished between the intellectual formula and the Christian substance of the creed. A Scandinavian believed we could reach "a deeper lying level of the soul" than the creeds. Again and again members used the word "faith" in ways not applicable to doctrine, sometimes unconsciously. An Anglican bishop believed that acceptance of faith in Christ is handed down by Chalcedon and in the Apostles' Creed. He meant acceptance of the faith and not the creed. Even Eastern church leaders admitted that the same faith might be expressed differently by different minds and one of them intimated his consciousness that they were discussing things which had no connection with the faith of the heart. Another Anglican bishop believed that reception of the sacraments was not identical with acceptance of any particular theory of them.

There was the evident feeling that they did not understand one another. The Eastern church brethren frankly said so. They were willing to commit themselves to the principle of federal unity, as they had already done in practice and action, and the late Bishop Gore expressed the judgment that if we can learn to act as one body on the moral and social field we may be better fitted to consider doctrine. The fact of the matter is that at Lausanne the spirit of the conference did not find expression in its actions, excepting in its message to the church and world. Differences were too much discussed and acted upon and the things in common did not find adequate expression. But even in the messages and reports the agreements outweighed the differences, when rightly weighed. The message stands out in vivid contrast to the reports in that it reveals a unity which the reports proceeded to invalidate by their emphasis on differences.

SOME CONCLUSIONS

We might sum up these agreements and differences as they appear, not simply in official utterances, but as we read between the lines. The representatives of the churches at Lausanne were at one in the spirit of the gathering and of the churches represented, as it appears in the message, in the consciousness that, underlying the imperfect expression of it in creeds, whether ancient or modern, there is a real unity of faith; that, whatever may be the variety of temperament, the Christian experience of all earnest followers of Christ is the same in both spiritual impulse and moral life; that the outreach of the human soul to God in the spirit of reverence and worship is the same; and finally that the message, mission and task of the Christian church are one and the same, so clearly that unity of ministry and service is an immediate possibility and an imperative demand.

The differences are in modes of thinking and in the effort to express religion in terms of intellectual belief; in the interpretation of history and tradition regarding the church and ministry; in the philosophy of the transmission of grace through the sacraments.

In this light let us appraise the World Conference on Faith and Order. When we take into account the wide variety of temperament, modes, manners and customs between, for example, a representative of the Methodist Episcopal Church South and of the Eastern churches, or between a Congregationalist and an Anglican; not to mention the differences between races and nations, is it not evident that the conference was maintained to the end and after by the Spirit of God? Lausanne was a success if its members will but learn its lessons. Some of its differences at least need only the spirit of liberty for their solution. It was made clear that there must be wide diversity through liberty and that unity cannot be realized in uniformity.

As Professor Percy Dearmer recently put it, "the faith that is to hold the allegiance of all good men must be broad and simple, and only the teaching of Christ is wide and deep enough for all the world," and "it is in the truth behind the creeds that all Christians believe." "The age of doctrinal unity has passed away and there is no possibility of educated and conscientious men agreeing in any one philosophy or theology." "The message of Christ is undimmed and living today because it was given in the terms of parable and poetry and not in the form of system, dogma, or code." "At the center must always be the personal communion of the soul with God; the whole field will be determined by the practice of a Christian ethic; but the rallying point, the sacramental nourishment" will lie in worship.

We may well venture to believe that another Lausanne Conference will find the way to a full expression of the latent but unexpressed spirit of the Christian churches. To be sure, the problem of institutional organization for Christian unity is still left, but it may be determined if and when unity is thus sought with diversity and liberty.

While thus the conference at Lausanne attempted to find unity by the same method and upon the same basis as the ecumenical councils, and lost it in its very search for it; there was one distinct difference between the two. As one member put it, they omitted the anathemas.

Since the Lausanne meeting the reactions from its constituent elements have come back to its continuation committee.

To a considerable extent they reveal the confusion of the conference itself. One interpretative volume[3] illustrates this by the reactions of a group of thirteen leading men.

THE DOCTRINE OF GRACE

Most significant, however, is the very recent result of a study by one of its committees. A group of theologians was named to make a study of one doctrine, the Doctrine of Grace.[4] This volume consists of interpretations of this article of belief by sixteen representatives of the following bodies: Protestant, the churches of Scotland, Denmark, Germany, Switzerland, Poland, the United States (Protestant Episcopal, Methodist Episcopal and Presbyterian), France (a Lutheran), Great Britain (the Free Churches), the Anglican and the Eastern Orthodox (Bulgaria, Greece). While it appeared after the author had expressed the foregoing judgments, it fully substantiates them. This volume brings Lausanne back to the message and to faith. As the Archbishop of York says, "It makes clear the important fact that Christians" are "asserting the same truth in different terms." He tells us that this discussion is important in showing "how far it must be regarded as necessary to unify our theology . . . before we can reunite in one all-embracing Christian Church."

To the theologically minded the whole volume will be an interesting study, although there is little in it that we did not know. The revealing portions, however, are the conclusions of the committee and of the Bishop of Gloucester and they are very significant indeed, albeit again the plain, average Christian was familiar with most of them.

First of all, the committee finds that the very word "Grace" is used "in three main senses," out of which they reach by both elimination and synthesis, one very simple meaning.

---

[3] "The Reunion of Christendom." Henry Holt & Co., 1929.

[4] "The Doctrine of Grace," edited by W. T. Whitley. Macmillan, 1932.

After discussing several subsidiary theological concepts, they confess to the paradox into which such a discussion always leads our feeble human minds, and conclude that "the mistake that has been made has been that theologians have aimed at philosophical consistency," and that "these speculations are not a necessary part of the Christian faith." (The plain simple Christian will hear it with relief and gratitude.) They find that "differences of emphasis and expression" imply differences of "racial temperament, religious experience and historical environment." Therefore if the churches "agree in holding the essentials of the Christian faith, such differences would form no barrier to union" and "through a complete union of the whole Christian church the presentment of the Christian life and teaching will be realized in all its fulness." (In other words, our unity will help us to discover the synthesis which Lausanne attempted as the anterior condition of unity, thus transposing cause and effect.) To which William Adams Brown adds that "we find the original antithesis softened and modified by an enlarging experience and more mature reflection. This is only to be expected in dealing with a subject so far transcending man's ability at any time to fathom or exhaust, as God's redemptive grace revealed in Jesus Christ." Dr. Brown believes in the possibility of recovering a synthesis (to which most men would doubtless agree provided it be characterized by simplicity).

Dr. J. Vernon Bartlet closes the academic discussion by asking, "Ought differences as to the meaning of sacramental grace, in senses not capable of experimental verification by faith—or the reverse—to be suffered still to keep apart those who in their personal apprehension of grace are united?" The Bishop of Gloucester answers. He tells us that the contemporary differences do not extend back to the New Testament. These theological abstractions are the substitution of an abstract scheme of salvation in place of personal faith. He grants value to them, but "they are not a necessary part of the Catholic faith." Indeed, in them often "the true meaning of grace is lost." He deprecates Professor Alivisatos' suggestion that the Eastern churches call a synod to formulate an article of doctrine which they have neglected. He tells us that "the Roman Church has been so anxious to say exactly what it believes that it has produced definitions which nobody really believes; and the Protestant churches were so anxious to say what they don't believe that they have deprived themselves very largely of the reality of the sacramental life." Finally here is his conclusion and confession;

> "1. The sacraments were made for use and not for definition.
>
> "2. They represent the work of the Holy Spirit . . . and those who have already yielded themselves to Christ have in them a new sanctifying life.
>
> "3. . . . the Christian life without its sacramental element becomes cold and wanting in religious warmth."

The difficulties "have arisen from substituting a doctrine of abstract grace for belief in the gracious goodness and loving kindness of God."

This volume has thus a more than negative value in that it really settles the questions discussed at Lausanne. It reveals the truth that salvation is not to be identified with metaphysics and that theological formulas have been largely determined by political and cultural circumstances, as well as by the mental and temperamental differences inherent in human nature. This affects not only "faith," but "order" as well, for, as a matter of fact, ecclesiastical administration, so often claiming to be of New Testament origin, has really been likewise determined by the circumstances of the body politic. Forms of thinking and of practice have thus often been humanly and not spiritually induced.

It is understood that the proposed volume, of similiar nature, on the sacraments, has been abandoned, but that one on the church is to be prepared. A discussion of the nature of the church is likely to be of value and more likely to discover the desired synthesis.

Lausanne, it is evident, must seek its common denominator elsewhere than in abstract doctrine or creed, especially when, as here, different bodies use the same term with different content. Lausanne attempted to reach heavenward by a very human tower of Babel, their language was confounded and they did not understand one another's speech. While the most simple-minded and simple-living Christians reached the Bishop of Gloucester's conclusions long ago without consulting this volume and its required lexicons, the author feels also that Professor Brown's demurrer is valid. Let the Theologians' Committee continue their studies, even though they will not reach finality until we cease to see through a glass darkly. But Christian unity cannot await this synthesis and need not, and such a search for adequate intellectual form for Christian truth and faith cannot be really enlightening and helpful until it is pursued by a united Christian body, meanwhile experiencing and expressing to the world, in oneness, its truth and faith expressed in devotion, worship and service. The Lausanne message got lost somewhere in Lausanne and should be rediscovered with all its implications.

This is but another way of saying that its leaders must extricate themselves from their intellectual disarray in debate and discover their oneness of spiritual perception. God and our life in Him can no more be discovered in the formulas of philosophy than in the test-tubes or by the telescopes of science, or by the so-called pure science of modern sociologists. It needs to be remembered that there are several million Christian men and women in the United Church who are not archbishops, bishops or theological scholars. The great affirmations, which will be considered in the closing chapter of this volume, they can understand just as fully as the theologians, perhaps more so.

Why may any group, official or otherwise, impose upon them, a system of philosophy, with any more right than the Pope of Rome, as a condition, either of their Christian standing or of their unity in Christ? Jesus did not leave us comfortless in our quest. He gave the Holy Spirit to guide not only ecumenical councils or reformers, but to guide us today, not into the ever paradoxical abstractions of our mental processes, but into the truth and faith of which they are but "broken lights." Meanwhile "let knowledge grow from more to more."

The official records of Lausanne fail to reveal its most significant lessons, but these are now being discovered. Anyone who reads the message [5] will find there the heart of the conference. Its tone and tenor are almost identical with those of Stockholm and Jerusalem. They "united in the common confession of faith in Jesus Christ, the Son of God . . . believing that the spirit of God is with us." The basis and symbol of unity is "the Gospel." All that Lausanne needs is to come back to the message from which it was led astray.

[5] Appendix IV.

CHAPTER IX

PRESENT PRACTICAL PROBLEMS AND DIFFICULTIES

Considering now the inclusive subject of Christian unity, whatever may be the form that it will ultimately take, we may call attention to some of the everyday problems, certain of which are organizational and others of which are more inherent. There are many such, of which the following are but illustrative examples. They are all subject to solution and simply constitute elements in the day's work. Many require, above all, an inextinguishable sense of humor.

While, as we have seen, federal unity has attained progressive coherence, it must be admitted that organizationally it calls at the present moment for real coöperative thinking. We have voluntary and uncontrolled bodies, considering and proclaiming themselves more or less representative of the churches, which duplicate expenditure of time, personnel and money. There are others which are legitimate and essential but which evade church counsel and are occasionally obstructive. Earnest individuals, when they conceive a new idea, still call conferences and try to organize still another federated movement. The Federal Council has, on occasions, had this personal problem to deal with, in connection with its own personnel. On the other hand, board administrators of the churches feel the sense of responsibility for the mission of the church to center pretty much in their respective areas. The writer recalls an occasion when a home missions officer revealed his elaborate plan for embracing practically all the functions of federation within the circle of the combined home missions boards as the highroad to unity. Indeed, there is an intensity of aim on the part of denominational boards which, while at times it precludes largeness of vision, at the same time induces unity, especially in coöperative action. The Federal Council and the International Council of Religious Education are still duplicating organization in some measure, especially in the state and local fields. The Universal Christian Council on Life and Work and the International Missionary Council are proceeding independently, forming practically two world federations of churches without relation to one another, each setting up an independent bureau of social research. Thus the charge that federal machinery is multiplied is valid. Perhaps it is a sign of promise, in that democracy may be defined as surely doing the right thing at last, after trying all the wrong things first.

There are still the forces of denominational reaction. Denominational assemblies take hostile action regarding particular federated movements or procedures, without adequate information and understanding. Indeed, there are few human groups that can become more irresponsible, at times, than denominational bodies, meeting once a year or less often, with changing personnel and lack of continuity in thinking. Thus some of them fluctuate from year to year in their attitude toward the Federal Council. On one occasion an assembly threatened to withdraw from the Council for taking an action which that denominational assembly had itself taken a year previous. Another assembly voted a certain sum for the Council through one committee and then through another committee voted to require the Council to meet the expenses of its delegates to an amount beyond the previous sum. Such actions are too often taken after many have left an assembly, which otherwise would not have been carried. There is thus a want of steadiness which makes dealing with assemblies very difficult.

There are sections of some of the denominations which preach unity the most but practice it sparingly, particularly because they have the consciousness that they themselves possess the final form for Christian union or constitute a mediating agency. Sometimes we hear a Southern Baptist dividing Christendom into three parts—Catholics, Protestants and Baptists. Among Lutherans there is the feeling that no unity is worthwhile unless it can be expressed in a somewhat complete and identical intellectual confession of faith. There are many obstructive forces. There are individual and group differences on both social and ecclesiastical questions to be reckoned with at all times. Fortunately these also exist within denominations and thus tend to retain equilibrium.

Due consideration needs to be given to the differences existing within denominations which are in the main dissensions between schools and parties. The fact is that there are some Congregationalists and Episcopalians, for example, who are closer together than certain groups within either of these bodies. This, of course, has become apparent in certain denominations of the United States in the discussions between so-called modernists and so-called fundamentalists.

When we look abroad at the international movement represented in the Universal Christian Council and the International Missionary Council there is still wide difference between certain attitudes of the Anglican and the Eastern churches on the one hand and the Protestant evangelical churches on the other. There are some of the latter, like the group which recently met at historic Marburg, who felt it to be a waste of time to attempt anything except a very clear-cut pan-Protestantism, the one thing which most irritates in certain Anglican circles.

There are many fond but fragile hopes that must be dispelled. Proposed expedients for reordination are obviously futile. It may take more time than promoters would wish to bring the Eastern churches to appreciate our educational methods and our social gospel and to lose their suspicion toward our mission boards, which they regard as proselyting agencies. Indeed, the International Missionary Council has a great opportunity for statesmanship in determining the territorial areas available for foreign missions. Not only the Eastern churches but the indigenous Protestant bodies in continental Europe are very sensitive to American and English occupation.

One can never be quite sure whether some of our brethren, both abroad and at home, associate themselves with these coöperative movements mainly or partly to see that they are wisely restrained and restricted, and, one might add, solemnly rebuked and chastened. A serious problem is the question as to how long those bodies of Protestantism which have a coherent conviction of their unity shall mark time for those whose halting is obstructive and the time may come when patience will cease to be a virtue. But we may hope not.

There is little or no doubt in the minds of coöperative thinkers, that there are spheres of service, now carried on partially by denominational and partially by interdenominational action and also areas where interdenominational relations are almost entirely confined to counsel and advice, which ought, with proper coöperative denominational guidance, to be released by the denominations to the Federal Council and associated bodies.

Thus far the inclusion of the branches of the Eastern churches in the United States in the Federal Council and local federations has gone no farther than friendly gesture, while these churches and those federated have many mutual problems which are of the utmost significance in our national and local life.

Variation of type and temperament among local federations calls for constant consideration in reaching the local field. Standardization is very difficult. Perhaps the greatest problem of all is that of reaching the pastors and churches of the nation, and securing, not only their sympathy and support, but their knowledge and understanding.

Another of the strongest reasons for what has seemed to be the slow progress of the movement for unity is sometimes overlooked. It is that of the diversity of the ideas which its advocates hold, and the reasons for which they think it desirable. Some of the proponents for unity are influenced largely by the questions of practicality and effectiveness, while at the other extreme we have those interested because it expresses a distinctively spiritual ideal. Some advocates are inclined to assume the continuance of our present denominational bodies and are concerned simply as to how they may work together without in any way affecting the denominational consciousness or altering its practice. At the other extreme we have those who would begin by abolishing all the denominations at one stroke and going back practically to the age of the ecumenical councils.

It should be frankly confessed that, in large measure, just as the original divisiveness of Protestant Christianity was due to the individualism of high-powered personalities, so today what might be called organizational individualism is a hindrance to institutional unification. Executive officials easily develop such a sense of excessive autonomy. They fear to be swallowed up by authority. Nationally this hinders unification, both by denominational and interdenominational bodies; and in state, regional and local areas the same personal influences are operative in efforts toward local and community unity. It largely accounts also for the multitude of voluntary and independent bodies seeking to represent the churches. It is perhaps the most difficult of the organizational problems of Christian unity, to which reference will be made in a later chapter. The writer has seen more than one great ideal halted in its progress because of the personal prejudice so easily induced among official administrators. In this connection it should be observed that the writer would humbly share any common confession of transgression. John Burroughs once remarked that another scientist, when in his own backyard, thought he was in the universe of animal life. How often we stand in our own light by taking ourselves too seriously.

Money, if not the root of all evil, is usually associated with it. One of the most difficult of readjustments to unified action is that of money-getting and spending. It is ecclesiastically and denominationally channeled and affects deeply every department of service. Even when willing to coöperate in activity, the denominational agencies are reluctant to allocate their funds for common ends. The Interchurch World Movement leaders conceived a plan to overcome this, but it lamentably failed. Here again, the personal element often intrudes itself, through the desire of responsible officials to justify an organization or an office, which bulks largely in their own vision. There are many important tasks which could be carried out with large economy, were the denominational units willing to have common treasuries for such objects. As it is, they have not yet adjusted their financial machinery to interdenominational work sufficient to take care of the coöperative service to which they are in principle and practice committed.

Some of these difficulties will ultimately adjust themselves. Others will probably always exist. Among the latter problems, there are two which may be modified but never disposed of; one is the constant appearance of parties or schools, like that known as fundamentalism; the other is that of cults, such as Christian Science.

Extreme examples of religious bodies which cut into the membership of the churches, or confuse the religious-minded among the common people are the Seventh Day Adventists and the so-called Russellites. The latter are reported as making serious inroads by house-to-house propaganda in some parts of Europe. Such groups as these are very hostile to federated Christianity.[1]

The extreme elements of the Fundamentalists have been hostile to unity of any kind unless on some extremely dogmatic basis. Its ideals of fellowship violated their fundamental contentions. The fact that fundamentalism has not had any seriously harmful effect on the movement for federal unity is largely due to the wisdom and sympathy of the majority of its adherents who, while warmly cherishing their own convictions, were willing and desirous to live at peace with their fellow Christians.

A recent volume[2] has appeared analyzing the theological movement led by Professor Karl Barth in Europe and estimating its effect on social Christianity and the movement for Christian unity. While, like the fundamentalist movement in the United States, some of the leaders and followers of this now somewhat organized body are extremely individualistic, aggressive and even contemptuous toward their fellow men who differ, it will doubtless have its day, and its adherents, with the exception of a persistent minority, will remain loyal to their churches and will have the Christian good sense to prevent it from disrupting them.

Of course this is suggestive of the breadth and sympathy which must characterize organized unity, permitting men and women to worship and serve together, even though they differ mentally and temperamentally.

---

[1] In 1912, following the Quadrennial meeting of the Federal Council, a Seventh Day Adventist leader wrote a substantial volume, the contention of which was that the Federal Council and the Pope were preparing an assault on the liberties of that sect.

[2] *"Der Weg der dialectischen Theologie durch die kirchliche Welt"* by Adolf Keller. Kaiser Verlag, 1931. A translation of this book under the title: "Karl Barth and Christian Unity" is to be brought out by the Macmillan Company this spring.

Still further, there will undoubtedly also be bodies, of which we have a good many in the United States, which will be eclectic and exclusive, and others which, while desirous of union, will not be considered temperamentally homogeneous, or sufficiently evangelical to be welcomed into a united body. These problems will not be readily solved, although we may look for many changes of attitude as fast as the churches function in closer local unity. In many localities now, churches are included in the local council of churches, while not in the Federal Council. Ultimately these local and regional influences will affect the national bodies, both denominationally and interdenominationally, but the solution of these problems cannot be hurried.

The saving feature of the situation lies in the fact that, in many ways, the differences between denominations as a whole are often less than those between their internal groups, so that federation is the means of preventing these schisms from becoming a disruptive force.

These enigmas have been stated in the somewhat kaleidoscopic manner, in which they appear from day to day, just to reveal the human factors with which we are called upon to deal, in order that we may inculcate patience, and, above all, take courage in the light of what these latter years have brought about rather than lament because one convention was not able to invoke uniformity of faith and order in a week or two. One of the best marks of a true prophet is his willingness that some things should be completed after he is dead and gone. As we survey the past progress we find these problems solving themselves, largely through increasing contact. Differences due to past history require little more than time for their solution. Divergencies in thinking are leading Christian men to rest upon the great and indisputable affirmations. Christian experience is discovered to be identical when men by intimate contact get deep beneath temperament and forms of expression to one another's souls. It means that unity simply needs the liberty that may allow for diversity. Few, if any, of the difficulties will long withstand the tide of the spirit now taking possession of the hearts of men the world over. They will be overcome by patience, persistence and persuasion. It took twenty-three years of conference to bring the Methodist bodies of England together. Let us then be willing that some things shall be consummated after we are gone.

Federal unity, both in the United States and internationally, is thus far from a finished product and in a later chapter we shall seek to indicate something of its path of reconstruction and advance in the immediate future. When we take what might be called the high central mind of the churches, these difficulties largely assume their minor place if seen in perspective. They mean little more than that we are dealing, in practice, with human frailties, which obstruct and defer, but which will be lost in the irresistible tide of the Spirit. It is often the problem of getting ourselves and other men to see large things large and small things small, to keep the long view while acting on the short distance.

CHAPTER X

PRESENT DENOMINATIONAL ATTITUDES

Protestant Bodies

Throughout all the period from the Reformation to the nineteenth century, while the Protestant bodies were increasing in their separativeness, the term "Protestantism" has survived and its deeper meaning has never been lost. Just what was meant by it was not perhaps clearly defined or has lost its significance, but it has always been assumed to have a meaning. Indeed, the Protestant spirit has never been prevailingly individualistic, but has always been social in its conception. There has been, and more especially during the past century and longer, a process of interpenetration, so that often, despite organizational division, there has been both a sense and a social influence justifying the term "Protestantism." Thus the present search for Protestant unity might carry us back to "apparently latent characteristics of the original movement," to use the words of Professor John T. McNeill.[1] As Professor McNeill reminds us, the movement or desire for unity was existent from the first and never entirely inactive. Schism and division were seldom conscious objectives. Catholicity was always sought or assumed. A recent study of John Calvin, by the present writer, discovered ideals of both Christian unity and social Christianity, which have been long obscured. On one occasion Calvin remarked that "little will be said about ceremonies before the judgment seat of God" and once wrote that he would gladly cross ten oceans to bring the diverse churches together.[2] Professor McNeill presents many historical evidences that "the continuity of the present-day union movement with the unionism of original Protestantism" is sufficiently indicated. In form he finds that it has been "conciliar" in type, as now exemplified in the organizations for federal unity. Both history and recent experience make it clear that unity is not alien to the genius and spirit of the Protestant churches.

---

[1] "Unitive Protestantism" by John T. McNeill. The Abingdon Press, 1930.

A volume[3] setting forth the distinctive characteristics of the constituent and coöperating bodies of the Federal Council has revealed, in large measure, the fundamental unity of these churches. As the writer observed then, this volume discovers "a sense of essential unity of practical aim which is certainly greater than the sense of their diversity." In several instances the distinctive characteristics of these bodies were found to be almost identical. Federal unity is thus normal. Indeed, there is often today a closer coöperative relation between these church bodies than that of the various boards within several of them. And when we come to analyze the theological differences and those relating to social Christianity, there are often much wider diversities within one of these bodies than between any two of them, even between any two most widely differing.

That the churches constituent to the Federal Council are committed to federal unity and to its progressive enlargement is no longer a question. Their attitude toward so-called organic union is not coherent. For the most part they are sympathetic and have sent their representatives to Lausanne. Protestant unity, both in the United States and in the world, is a relatively simple problem, requiring only time, understanding and patience. Like all rules, however, there are exceptions. A study of denominational attitudes is essential, in that it reveals both the hopes and possibilities and the things to be overcome. It will be discovered that, in many cases, there is a diversity of temperament and idea, which, on the one hand, constitutes a problem, but, on the other hand, reveals an essential inclusiveness. Some of these church bodies are microcosms of unity.

---

[2] "The Permanent Contributions of Geneva and John Calvin to Church and State in America" by Charles S. Macfarland. *The Reformed Church Review,* October, 1925.

[3] "The Churches of the Federal Council" edited by Charles S. Macfarland. Revell, 1916.

Major attention will be given, in this chapter, to those bodies of churches whose attitude is more or less undetermined.

The Congregational and Christian Churches

For a considerable period of its history, autonomy and individualism prevailed, both within the Congregational body and in its attitude toward other bodies. Its own constituent boards were long characterized by independence. As a matter of fact, however, the Congregational search for internal unity has constantly developed into the desire for larger union, both federal and organic. The general feeling has been that the former is the road to the latter, toward which leading Congregationalists are sympathetic. The Congregational Church has several times made overtures to other bodies, notably to the Free Baptist, the United Brethren, the Methodist Protestant, the Universalist and the Christian Church, and has finally secured union with the last named. It has responded with promptness to all proposals of any and every kind and for a period of years exercised leadership in conferences with the Protestant Episcopal Church toward what was termed "reunion." Its attitude has always been unwavering and it may be said to be ready for anything in which the churches may find agreement, which at the same time conserves the essential liberty for which Congregationalism has always stood.

It has thus furnished more than its numerical proportion of leaders in the larger life of the churches as a whole.

Indeed, perhaps personal leadership is the outstanding contribution of Congregationalism to Christian unity.

The Christian Church, recently united with the Congregational body, has always been sympathetic and forward looking on Christian unity and its attitude has been signally inspiriting.

THE UNITARIAN AND UNIVERSALIST CHURCHES

While the Unitarian (Congregational) churches are a separate denomination, their history was one with the now sometimes designated Trinitarian Congregational churches for two centuries. Any future reunion of these two bodies may best be left to them. Doubtless many of the questions which separated them are no longer of divisive significance. There are many Unitarians who hold to some present-day trinitarian interpretations, or at least do not regard them as prohibitive of fellowship, and many Congregationalists who lean toward at least a moderate Unitarianism. (This is true of others than Congregationalists.) There are yet, however, many of the former who might be termed "illiberally liberal," and who still believe in their special theological mission.

It should be noted that in France the liberal bodies are constituents of the French Protestant Federation and leading members are in the Protestant Faculty of Paris. In the United States, national coöperation is confined to consultative relations in such Federal Council objectives as social service, race and international relations. The local federations vary—some, notably Massachusetts and Boston, including the Unitarian churches.

Reference may also appropriately be made here to the Universalist churches. While these are regarded as more "Evangelical" than the Unitarian, they have been so closely associated with the latter in New England that they occupy much the same place in the mind of other churches. They may, before long, either federate or unite.

In the judgment of the writer the relationship of these bodies may well be left to them, especially in view of past history and of their close association in New England, where they are so largely located. Both the Unitarian and Universalist bodies are still somewhat eclectic, and the question of their inclusion in any movement for unity on the part of the so-called Evangelical churches is to a considerable extent one of homogeneity. Evangelicalism is a term that denotes spirit and temper as well as theological conceptions. On the whole, it may be said that, on the one hand, the Evangelical bodies have become more liberal, and meanwhile many so-called liberals have become less iconoclastic.

The Methodist Churches

Methodist division has always been on organization, practice and policy, never on matters of doctrine or worship. Its various bodies are more or less federated in a world ecumenical body. The two large bodies in the United States and the Methodist Protestant have standing committees and have had very serious conference on union. At the present moment the Methodist Episcopal, the northern body, is also in conference with certain non-Methodist bodies concerning organic union.

The Methodist churches are committed to coöperation and federal unity, are always irenic in discussion and have participated sympathetically with all proposals, whether of a federal or organic nature. Doubtless Methodism, as a whole, would accept any general plan, on broad lines. The recent union of Methodist bodies in England may well be regarded as a harbinger of the future in America.

Presbyterian and Reformed Churches

Here again we find responsive sympathy, with the exception of ultra-conservative elements in the two main Presbyterian bodies and in the Reformed Church in America (the so-called Dutch Reformed). The Presbyterian Church in the United

States of America (the northern body) has issued a multitude of pronouncements on unity or union.

These bodies, as a whole, with the possible exception of the Presbyterian Church in the United States (the southern body) which at times varies from one annual assembly to another, are on the whole warmly sympathetic toward unity or union. Even the conservative elements are generally sympathetic to family union and are members of the alliance of Presbyterian and Reformed churches, and the southern Presbyterian body would doubtless ultimately approve any generally adopted plan that was regarded as evangelical.

There are committees of conference on union of the Presbyterian and Reformed bodies and also between certain of these bodies and others, including a recent proposal for union between the Reformed Church in the United States (the so-called German Reformed) and the Evangelical Synod of North America, another body of German origin.

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (the northern) has effected union with the Cumberland Presbyterian and the Welsh Calvinistic churches and is now conferring or even negotiating with the United Presbyterian Church.

The Presbyterian and Reformed churches have made it pretty clear that they would insist on recognition of the orders of the Presbyterian ministry and that of its membership without any further ordination or confirmation, although this by no means implies compliance with the observation of Dean Inge that Apostolic succession exists only in "the lives of the saints."

That this family of churches will ultimately become one, there is little doubt.

OTHER BODIES OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL

Like those previously referred to, nearly all of the bodies constituent to the Federal Council are committed to federal unity and on the whole sympathetic toward organic union. Indeed, some of the smaller bodies, such as the Friends, the Moravians, the Evangelical Church, the United Brethren and the Seventh-Day Baptists, have exercised an influence out of proportion to their size in the movement for federal unity and would be likely to follow it toward a more organic form.

Thus far we have considered those bodies which have manifested a somewhat general sympathy with unity as a whole. We need now to consider some others whose position is less unequivocal.

THE BAPTIST CHURCHES

A clear division must be made between the northern and southern bodies in the United States. The Northern Baptist Convention is constituent to the Federal Council and would doubtless follow along with the movement for federal unity, although there is a minority, composed of members of fundamentalist sympathies, which is critical and at times hostile. The Baptist churches carry autonomy among themselves to an extreme and yet are very effectively unified in organization and service, although at times disclaiming this unity among themselves.

These churches constitute so large an element in our religious life that their main utterance on organic union is worthy of record. At the anniversaries of the Northern Baptist Convention held in Denver in May, 1919, a statement prepared by a convention committee was unanimously adopted as follows:

> "Whereas, the Northern Baptist Convention has been invited to send delegates to a council looking toward organic union of the Protestant denominations, it is
>
> "Resolved, That the Northern Baptist Convention, while maintaining fraternal relations with evangelical denominations in extending the influence of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, does not believe that organic union with other denominations is

possible. It therefore declines to send delegates to the proposed council.

"In declining this invitation, however, Christian courtesy demands that the Northern Baptist Convention should state its position as to organic union with other Christian denominations. This we make not with any desire to pose as judge of our Christian brethren, but in the interest of mutual understanding.

"The Baptist denomination is a collection of independent democratic churches. Not one of these churches recognizes any ecclesiastical authority superior to itself. They are grouped in associations, state conventions, and a national Convention, but none of these groups has any control over a local church beyond that which lies in common faith, practice, and service. The denomination, in so far as it has unity, is a federation of independent democracies. In the nature of the case, therefore, anything like organic union of Baptist Churches with other denominations is impossible. There is no centralized body that could deliver Baptist Churches to any merger or corporate unity. If Baptist Churches do not have organic unity among themselves, they obviously cannot have organic unity with other denominations. By the very nature of our organization, we are stopped from seeking organic union with other denominations.

"This situation does not arise from any desire on our part as Baptists to withhold ourselves from fellowship with other Christian bodies in the pursuance of Christian work. Nor does it arise from any desire to impose upon them our own convictions. We grant to others all rights that we claim for ourselves. But the liberty of conscience and the independence of the churches which characterize our position are involved in our fundamental conception as to the nature of the Church and of its relation to the religious life.

"We believe in the complete competency of the individual to come directly into saving relationship with God. We hold that a church is a local community of those who have consciously committed themselves to Jesus Christ. The only Church Universal is, in our belief, spiritual fellowship of individual souls with God. We do not believe in any form of sacerdotalism or sacramentalism among Christians, who are all equally priests of the Most High. We reject ecclesiastical orders and hold that all believers are on a spiritual equality. With us ordination is only a formal recognition on the part of some local church that one of its members is judged worthy to serve as a pastor. The fact that such appointment is generally recognized in all our churches is simply a testimony to denominational good faith.

"We cannot modify these convictions for the sake of establishing a corporate unity with other denominations. Any compromise at this point would be an abandonment of structural beliefs.

"We heartily believe in the necessity of a combined impact of Christian forces upon the evil of the world. Such impact, however, does not depend for its efficiency upon organic union of the churches. We are convinced that our fundamental conception of the Church, the nature of our organization, the democracy which is the very basis of our denominational life, make any organic union with groups of Christians holding opposite views unwise and impossible."

At the same anniversaries of the Northern Baptist Convention held in Denver a statement prepared by the Convention Committee on Faith and Order was unanimously adopted. It bears especially upon the matter of the validity of ordination to the Christian ministry and reads as follows:

"In the year 1910, the Protestant Episcopal Church in America requested the various Protestant denominations to appoint commissions to unite with it in calling and arranging for a world conference to discuss the questions of Christian faith and order. . . . Your Commission has had a number of informal conferences with representatives of the Episcopal Church. Its hope is that in a world conference we may arrive at some basis of faith and order upon which the divided Christian denominations may become united into one Church of God, and present a uniform witness of the Gospel to the world. . . . From meetings thus far held it has become evident to your Commission that the Episcopal Church stresses the necessity of Episcopal ordination as a primal necessity to validate the exercise of the ministry in the Church. It proposes, however, a concession to the non-Episcopal clergy who may be willing to accept Episcopal ordination at the hands of Episcopal bishops. Ministers of other denominations seeking such ordination shall not be required to accept the Episcopal theory, but only the fact of the Episcopate. It differentiates these terms; meaning by 'theory' the doctrine of an unbroken historic succession of the ministry traceable to the apostles; whereas by the word 'fact' it means that the Episcopal form of governmnt has historically vindicated itself as desirable and efficient. In thus accepting the fact, without the theory, it hopes that the non-Episcopal churches, especially the ministers, may without the sacrifice of any vital principle see their way clear to act upon the ground of expediency, and so meet what is to the Episcopal communion a matter of conscience. Your Commission has been unequivocal in its reply to these propositions. We have said to the Episcopal Commission with utmost candor that the trend of our views and attitude concerning ordinances, sacraments, and ministry of the Church are at such variance with its conceptions that we are convinced that its above-named overtures would not elicit the interest, much less a serious consideration, on the part of our Baptist people. On these grounds there is nothing to hope for in the direction of church union."

It should be observed, however, that the first statement, like a good many convention votes, may not have been the subject of much serious analysis. Furthermore, the Northern Baptist Convention later appointed "credentialized messengers" to the first Lausanne Conference and the executive committee of the convention has voted to appoint delegates to the next Lausanne meeting, as the British Baptists have done. Probably there are multitudes of Baptists who would not accept the Denver statement, largely among the younger element. It has been made evident, however, that Baptist bodies would not consider any form of Episcopal ordination, either in fact or theory as binding on them, as a basis of union.

The Southern Baptist Convention is unsympathetic toward and at times hostile to, any movement for union, although there are a good many individual churches and pastors favorable to the federal idea. This body is so strictly conservative on immersion and on complete local independence that we must await the processes of time. They did, however, coöperate with the Federal Council during the war and are now represented in the work of the chaplains of the army and navy. How far the Baptist constituency in the South would dissent from the attitude of the convention, it would be difficult to determine.

THE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST

Here again we have a church loosely unified within itself. Although this body was organized for the very cause of unity, it has at times been, through some leaders and groups, both internally and externally divisive. While it has always disclaimed being a denomination, it has taken on all denominational forms, organizations and methods, and includes strongly sectarian elements. While the Disciples have avoided making membership in their own body the means of unity they have so insisted upon certain principles as conditions of unity that it amounts to about the same thing.

At the same time this body is a real influence for unity through an unusually large number of earnest personalities and important groups of breadth and largeness of sympathy. Efforts have been made for union with other bodies, notably the Baptist, but without much seriousness. They are constituents of the Federal Council, but probably largely because they believe it to be a pathway to the closer unity to which they are in principle committed.

The present attitude of some elements in the Disciples of Christ reminds one of those earlier disciples who failed to contribute to unity, according to Paul, by naming themselves as "of Christ." It illustrates the extent to which a group may isolate itself by its very earnestness for unity when its thinking is limited to its own circle of ideas. It is to be regretted that the one denomination born of the idea of universal Christian fellowship should not have better succeeded in avoiding both external and internal dissension.

THE LUTHERAN BODIES

The several Lutheran bodies constitute striking exceptions to other Protestant churches in their attitudes. Here, however, we find an interesting exception to the exception. While in the United States the Lutheran bodies are but consultatively associated with the Federal Council, in Europe they are often among the leaders in the movement for unity.

In earlier days, as we have recorded, Samuel Schmucker was a great American leader. The former General Synod of the Lutheran Church in the United States was a constituent body of the Federal Council until merged in the United Lutheran Church in America, which now sustains the more limited "consultative" relationship.

Inasmuch as the Lutheran churches throughout the world, because of their size and their own unity, are an important factor in our problem, it is of value in our study to record the utterance of the United Lutheran Church in America as set forth in 1920,[4] which doubtless expresses present attitudes. This statement is characterized by the exactness which accords with the genius of Lutheranism. It is an interesting study in theology, polity and practical affairs. It insists upon unity in "confession," for any organic union. Desire is expressed "to coöperate with other Christians in works of serving love in so far as this can be done without surrender of its interpretation of the Gospel, without denial of conviction, and without suppression of its testimony as to what it holds to be the truth." Broadly interpreted, the utterance would seem to be consonant with many or most of the principles underlying federal unity, at least in possible implications.

The Lutheran churches are concerned with the unification of their own bodies, both in the United States and in the world and regard this as the most important contribution they can make to any larger unity. So far as the writer's observation and experience are concerned, any assumption that they become more effectively united among themselves by magnifying their separatism from others is faulty, both in theory and fact. The spirit of unity is, on the whole, a pervasive force, acting and reacting in such manner that unity tends to inspire unity. In any event, a loyalty that is thus created is not likely to endure. If the Lutheran churches in the United States should assume a more whole-hearted sympathy with other bodies, it may well be believed that this would bring about, not a decrease, but an enlarging measure of Christian service on their part. There is perhaps a lack of faith in the opinion expressed by the late and highly esteemed Dr. M. G. G. Scherer, that Christian unity is ever to be something hoped for but never to be attained,[5] and it may be frankly stated that, in the United States, the present seemingly unsympathetic, and at times critical attitude of some Lutheran leaders constitutes an obstacle to unity both among others and within their own house. We may well believe that this will disappear with more understanding and closer association.

---

[4] Appendix V.

Reference has been made only to the United Lutheran Church, as it would be difficult to interpret the mind of the other Lutheran bodies, several of which are composed of the descendants of European Lutheranism, nationally constituted or connected, and one of which, the Missouri Synod, keeps separate from the other Lutheran bodies. The United Lutheran Church sent representatives to the Stockholm Conference on Life and Work, whose report was rather critical of that meeting. This church was also represented at Lausanne. There are undoubtedly reasons for the conservative Lutheran attitude not easily understood by other groups, which make it more difficult for these churches to express an innate sympathy with unity through formal organization. While the relation of the United Lutheran Church is consultative, its president has served as chairman of one of the committees of the Federal Council. Very often, in local fields, Lutheran pastors and laymen participate in the leadership of local councils.

[5] "Christian Liberty and Church Unity" by M. G. G. Scherer. Revell, 1932.

Viewing Lutheranism as a world body, it should be observed that, in its several parts, there are wide differences in government, some being episcopal and others free; in liturgy and in other ways; all, however, holding to what is termed the confession. In several respects they are the least unified of any of the larger bodies or families of churches. President Frederick H. Knubel, however, recently prophesied complete Lutheran reunion. It may well be hoped that this will be an influence in the direction of larger unity rather than toward intensified exclusiveness, the latter having been the result when the General Synod in the United States united in the present United Lutheran Church, the General Synod having been previously a constituent body of the Federal Council. This latter course might do no more than to delay ultimate enlargement.

The mutual approaches of Lutherans and members of the Reformed Churches in Europe, referred to in an earlier chapter, may not be without influence in the United States, in view of the close relations between the Lutheran bodies.

Other Denominations and Sects

Most of the other religious bodies are exclusive, often divided into groups even when of the same name and family. They are generally centered on some one idea which they hold to be essential. Many are small in number and, although in the aggregate they constitute a considerable proportion, they hardly enter as yet into our question. We may, however, look to the increase of local federative and community movements to bring about a change of attitude.

The Protestant Bodies and Federal Unity

Thus it will be seen that in the United States the federal form of unity, with its relative simplicity, is likely to develop into larger and larger proportions among the constituent bodies of the Federal Council, while the organic movement is sympathetically regarded as a long look ahead by several bodies and as an impossibility by others. In the meantime there will be more or less organic groupings, reducing the number of Protestant bodies. We need here again to learn to hold long views, but ever to act on short distances.

While it is not deemed best to attempt in this volume any similar analysis of church bodies in Europe, it will be evident from the historical sections of this volume that there is much the same situation among Protestant bodies in Continental Europe and among the Free Churches of Great Britain. The Protestant bodies of Europe have generally followed the same course as that of the Federal Council and there are similar federations in nearly all countries. They have practically all united in the Universal Christian Council on Life and Work and the International Missionary Council. So far as the Conference on Faith and Order is concerned they have, on the whole, taken its proposals with seriousness. In foreign mission lands there is the same trend, with frequent occasions of progressive procedure going beyond their boards at the home base. In Continental Europe the Central Bureau for Inter-Church Aid practically constitutes a European Federation, its members being officially appointed to represent the churches, in one special field. The general trend of the church bodies in all parts of the world corresponds fairly with that of the churches in the United States.[6]

Thus it may be affirmed that world-wide federal unity among Protestant churches is being achieved in practice, whatever may be its future. Even the Lutheran bodies in the United States are not likely to be an exception, for while they take a position which in theory seems to preclude it, they are constantly recognizing and practicing it, more especially in Europe, but also in the United States under the terms coöperation and consultation. The relationship of the Lutheran and Protestant Episcopal Churches is much like that of the Government of the United States toward the League of Nations, that of official detachment with a practical participation which grows with more understanding and with deepening obligation in the furtherance of common interests.

---

[6] See "Documents on Christian Unity" by G. K. A. Bell. Oxford University Press.

The assumption that this unity of the Protestant churches is, has been or will be a hindrance to any larger movement is, in the judgment of the writer, not only contrary to fact but also untrue in principle. To be sure, theoretically it might be, but it has not been and need not be. Indeed, it is obvious to all familiar with the matter that the Lausanne Conference discovered this.

There is almost always the fictitious assumption that while, on the one hand, there is a hopeless disunity on the part of Protestant forces, there is an ideal unity among Roman Catholic forces and Hebrew forces. As a matter of fact, while there is unity and uniformity of organization in the Roman Catholic Church, one is amazed on more familiar acquaintance with its practical affairs, to find the extent of divisiveness among its own groups and personalities. Indeed, during the war it was sometimes easier to get unified action by Protestant bodies than it was on the part of the Roman Catholic Church. There are personal and group divisions and hostilities within the Roman Catholic Church, which do not appear, but which are fully as real as Protestant organizational disunity.

Generally speaking, it may be said that to a considerable extent unity among most of the main Protestant bodies is a question of organization rather than of any inherent obstacles.

We have, however, infinitely larger possibilities than Protestant unity, and this brings us to consider the Anglican (including the Protestant Episcopal) and Eastern communions.

These bodies have a history, traditions, temperamental qualities and standards quite different from those of the distinctively Protestant groups. The Protestant Episcopal Church may be said to occupy a mediating position between the Protestant and Anglican Churches,[7] being closely associated with the latter by history, tradition and standards, while almost equally so with the Protestant churches of the United States in community life and practical service to the world.

The Protestant Episcopal Church

The Protestant Episcopal Church is a body with both strong bonds of unity and wide differentiations. Probably all of its constituency is committed to the principle of organic union as represented by the Lausanne Conference. One section of it is either hostile or lukewarm toward federal unity as exemplified in the Federal Council, while by far the larger proportion is either heartily in sympathy with it or favorably disposed. Some of its clergy and laity are either extremely Catholic or equally Protestant in leaning. The Episcopal churches, moreover, do not lend themselves as readily to certain forms of coöperation as do the other Protestant bodies; more especially in the field of comity and the distribution of churches, owing to differences from the other Protestant churches in forms of worship and especially in matters of polity.

The consequent element of anomaly is indicated by the fluctuation in the actions of the General Convention relative to the Federal Council. On one occasion the House of Deputies voted for constituent membership, but the House of Bishops failed to concur, while at a later convention this process was reversed. At one convention a resolution to join the council was actually passed by a slight majority, near the end of the session after many had gone home, but the vote was miscounted and declared lost. This confusion is largely accounted for by much misunderstanding and there is little doubt but that a clear and adequate consideration of the question would produce a substantial majority for full membership in the Federal Council. In local federations, Protestant Episcopal churches, rectors and laymen frequently occupy positions of leadership. At some conventions, affiliation with the Federal Council has been prevented also by the influence of reactionary laymen hostile to the Council's program in social, industrial or international affairs. Probably, however, the chief cause of reluctance is revealed by the following action of an early convention:

---

[7] The term "communion" is used by the Anglican bodies as a generic term comprehending all the churches in communion with the See of Canterbury. The Archbishop of Canterbury is recognized as *primus interpares.*

> "Resolved, That the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church hereby records its gratitude to Almighty God for the growing sympathy and closer relations between bodies of Christians, as evidenced by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America; but the strong conviction of this Church is that the ideal of our Lord for His people is organized unity in one body; realizing, however, the desirability of Christian cooperation, where practicable, without the sacrifice of principle, this Convention expresses the opinion that the Commissions on Christian Unity and on Social Service may appoint representatives to take part in the Federal Council."

Meanwhile, coöperation on the part of the Protestant Episcopal Church, both officially and by individuals, has steadily increased, and the National Council of the Church is now designated as a "cooperating agency" of the Federal Council. On the other hand, the recent development of closer relations with the Anglican Church through the Lambeth Conferences has had a somewhat deterrent influence on the Protestant Episcopal Church, while this has also been somewhat counterbalanced by the relationship of the Anglican Church with the Universal Christian Council on Life and Work as well as with the World Conference on Faith and Order. Indeed, several members of what is known as the Catholic Party in the Episcopal Church have actively coöperated in the work of the Federal Council and serve in its commissions.

The Protestant Episcopal Church is thus feeling its way. It is divided within itself in its attitude toward Christian unity, one extreme being distinctly Protestant while the other is decidedly Catholic, some with the forlorn hope of reunion with Rome. Its future position in the United States will be largely determined by the development of world movements, which we discuss in another chapter and more particularly by the course of the World Conference on Faith and Order. A high order of moral influence might easily bring the Protestant Episcopal Church into a position of real leadership, in both the United States and in the world, a statesmanship which has as yet found no leader since the lamented death of Bishop Charles H. Brent, a prophet who received all too scant recognition in his own church. Dr. William C. Emhardt, in recent articles, appears to express the judgment that the Anglican Church, including the Protestant Episcopal, has lost its opportunity and that the Eastern churches are to become the mediating body. The writer, however, is far from concurrence in this opinion.

The Protestant Episcopal Church in itself reveals the larger possibilities of unity. There is probably no other religious body within which there are such wide divergencies, in intellectual conception, in attitude of spirit, in interpretation and, indeed, in temperament. Its want of strong leadership is making it at times a hindrance, while it is constituted to be a prophetic force, in Christian unity, standing as it does in close relations with the Protestant churches on the one hand and the Anglican and Eastern on the other. If one may be entirely frank, the Episcopal Church has the material for personal leadership in abundance, but it does not elect such men to a sufficient degree to its ecclesiastical and directing offices.

At the same time, due consideration should be given to the fact that the problems involved in the Protestant Episcopal Church are less simple than with other Protestant bodies. For example, the practice of comity in the distribution of territory is far more difficult between a liturgical church and a non-liturgical than between two non-liturgical bodies. This has often led to unwarranted criticism on many occasions. At the same time there have been instances of the establishment of Protestant Episcopal churches in small communities, when their communicants might have been associated with adjacent churches in order to conserve interests of polity.

THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

The Lambeth Conferences, while given to the consideration of the affairs of the Anglican Communion, beginning in 1867, have come to be considered as colloquies on church unity. These conferences have issued utterances on the subject from time to time, including proposals for mutual discussion, but we need only consider the latest issued in 1930[8] which, however, includes parts of the statement of 1920. It presents an analysis of the situation, deplores it and expresses regret that the Anglican Communion is "unable to agree in recommending such reciprocal advances as many of our fellow Christians in other communions would welcome," especially regarding "interchangeability of ministries." It adds, however, "We would urge the appropriateness and importance of united efforts to preach *our one Gospel.*"

Full consideration is given to the "four points sometimes referred to as the Lambeth Quadrilateral; the Scriptures; the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds; the Sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion; and the Historic Episcopate" "as the Anglican basis for negotiations with a view to reunion."

The encyclical letter of 1930, however, says that "the expression of final judgments on individual schemes (of reunion) is premature." Meanwhile coöperation in evangelism is approved and the hope is expressed that such efforts as those of Stockholm, Lausanne and Jerusalem "may lead to some kind of permanent association of all the Christian churches that may become the spiritual counterpart of the League of Nations."

---

[8] Appendix VI.

Upon reading the fuller statement[9] the reader will perhaps say, "many words" and "why so many words?" There is an unquestioned lack of simplicity in the Lambeth utterances, due undoubtedly to the fact that this body is inclined to a full realization of its responsibility. However, the Anglican Church is the one body best constituted for leadership in the great movement for world unity. It does occupy a mediating position in its association with the Protestant Episcopal Church, between the Protestant churches and the Eastern churches. Dr. Adolf Keller has given it the descriptive title "the bridge church." Here again, it must be admitted, there is a call for personal leadership which has as yet found no adequate response. It is especially to be regretted that the Anglican Church has been so loosely associated (largely through a few individuals) with the Universal Christian Council on Life and Work. Moreover, its own internal differences are indicated by a recent effort on the part of so-called Catholics and Evangelicals to unite on "eucharistic unity." The resultant statement agreed upon by representative leaders may well be made a matter of record:

"EUCHARISTIC UNITY

"AGREED STATEMENT OF ANGLICAN BELIEF

"As a result of a Conference of Catholics and Evangelicals, held under the Chairmanship of the Master of the Temple, a document concerning Eucharistic belief was drawn up and, with the approval of the Archbishop of York, circulated for signature among representative clergy.

---

[9] Appendix VI.

"The object was to prove to the world that the Church of England is *not* hopelessly divided within itself; to show that reconciliation is possible, and that our underlying unity is far greater than our differences; and to stimulate the right sort of controversy, and to discourage the wrong, which begins by failing even in the wish to understand what others think and feel and mean.

"The statement is as follows:

'EUCHARISTIC DOCTRINE

'Acknowledging that, inasmuch as God is Love, the Life of God the Son, alike in the eternal sphere and in its earthly manifestation, is a life of self-giving to the Father, we believe:

'(1) That our Lord, on the eve of His Passion, instituted the Sacrament of Holy Communion in remembrance of Himself and for the special commemoration of his Death, and that the Church has therefore been right in regarding the Eucharist as the most sacred act in her worship;

'(2) That the Lord, Who has promised to abide forever with His Church, is Himself the real Minister in every Sacrament, using by the operation of the Holy Spirit the visible acts and audible words of an earthly minister;

'(3) That the Consecration is the Act of the unseen Lord, in response to the liturgical prayer and action, taken as a whole, in which the officiating priest and the worshippers alike have their share;

'(4) That such consecration has a real effect, since the consecrated elements are, by the Will of God, now charged with a new spiritual significance and purpose, being the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ;

'(5) That, while the Consecration passes into effect in virtue of the Divine Will and the intention of the Church as a whole, the benefit of reception is dependent upon the faith and dispositions of the worshippers;

'(6) That the Divine Liturgy constitutes one whole, in which the reception of the sacred elements forms an essential part;

'(7) That the Celebration of the Liturgy shows forth our Lord's Sacrifice as that which has, once for all, reconciled the world to God;

'(8) That our Lord's Sacrifice, which reached its climax at Calvary, was completed by His Resurrection and Ascension, whereby His incarnate life was carried forward into the unveiled

Presence of the Father, thus establishing a new relation of mankind to God;

'(9) That the virtue of our Lord's Sacrifice was made available for us through the coming of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost, when the Church became the agent of His redemptive purpose;

'(10) That as the Risen and Ascended Christ is ever with the Father as the Royal High Priest of mankind, so at the Lord's Table we celebrate and make before the Divine Majesty the Memorial which He has willed, becoming thus united with our Lord in His Sacrifice, which sustains the new moral and spiritual order prepared for redeemed humanity;'

"and we affirm that the faithful use of the Lord's Supper can alone reveal its inexhaustible meaning, and that in the unity of experience we shall draw nearer to unity in belief."

It would require a volume in itself to analyze these messages, but attention may well be called to a few significant points. First of all, the Lambeth message acknowledges that all Christians seeking reunion share a "life of fellowship" in the spirit. The causes of division lie deep in the past and are in large measure due to self-will. The united church must make place for all who confess Christ.

One's first impulse is that this makes the question of unity a very simple one and that there can be no purely human traditions in the way. There follow, however, qualifications which are difficult to reconcile with the broad inclusive opening of the message. For example, there can be no exchange between Episcopal and non-Episcopal ministers so long as there are any differences of conviction on faith (meaning doctrine) and order. And yet at the same moment we find approval in the message of joint evangelism. That is to say, the messengers are preaching a common message and yet may not express their fellowship in doing so.

The restoration of union is primarily a matter of faith and order, on which there are as yet insuperable difficulties, while at the same time the message states that the Anglican communion does not call in question the "spiritual reality" of non-Episcopal ministries. One wonders what completer oneness there can be than that of "spiritual reality." The explanation is that inter-communion must be a goal rather than a means. Finally, the episcopate must be a *sine qua non,* because it will bring "gifts of grace." Yet previously it had been affirmed that these gifts of grace had also come without an episcopate to some Christians, whether in fact or theory.

The question might well be raised whether the Lambeth utterance best represents the soul of Anglicanism or that of its representative leaders who believe "that the faithful use of the Lord's Supper can alone reveal its inexhaustible meaning, and that in unity of experience we shall draw nearer to unity of belief." May not the difference be that the Lambeth message was formulated under organized institutional influence while the other, on eucharistic unity, was the natural expression of free spirits?

Perhaps this question is answered in the 1930 encyclical letter, especially relative to South India, as follows:

> "Our Lord Himself prayed that those who should believe on Him might be one that the world might believe that His Father had sent Him. The witness which He wishes us to bear to Him before the world is our unity in Him. A world torn with divisions is pathetically ready to acclaim our unity, when it comes into sight, as an evidence of the power of God.
>
> "In the Conference of 1920 we felt the constraint of a great impulse which we believed to be of Divine origin, and under its influence we sent out the Appeal to all Christian people. In this Conference we have something even greater to chronicle, definite actions tending to unions of Churches, in which some of our Churches are closely concerned. If holy aspirations are great; God-guided actions are greater.
>
> . . . .
>
> "The scheme for a union of churches in South India . . . has now reached an advanced stage. Our brethren of the Church of

India, Burma and Ceylon, who will have the responsibility for carrying it through, if it is to be consummated, have reported the scheme in its present state to the Conference and asked for our advice. Our Committee has tendered advice on many points in its Report, to which the Conference has given its general approval. This scheme is for a union in South India between the members of our Church and the Wesleyan Methodist Church, and the South India United Church, so called because it unites the converts of certain Presbyterian and Congregationalist Missions. The general conception of the scheme is that these different elements will come together in one body, possessing the traditional framework of faith and order which characterized the whole Church for so many centuries. Within this one body the constant intercourse of the different members will, it is hoped, gradually bring about a unity, in which all those things that are of God in their several traditions will be not only preserved but enriched by happy combination. This process cannot be initiated without sacrifices, and must in its early stages involve anomalies and irregularities—a prospect which gives rise to serious misgivings in many minds. But these misgivings are outweighed by hope and by our trust in God's will to perfect His work of reconciliation.

"We rejoice that one part of the Anglican Communion should be found ready to make this venture for a corporate union with certain non-Episcopal Churches. We feel that in a sense our brethren in South India are making this experiment on behalf of the whole body of the Anglican Churches. They are our pioneers in this direction of the movement for unity. The whole Communion will surely stand by them with earnest prayer and generous loyalty. But we are well aware that the constituency which we represent is not universally convinced about all the provisions of the Scheme, and wishes to see how it works out, before committing itself to definite approval. To meet this situation we have recommended to the Churches concerned certain arrangements which we desire to explain to our people in the clearest terms.

"The Anglican Communion is a group of Churches bound together by very close ties of history and traditions, doctrine and practice. After the union in South India, Anglicans who will be included in the united Church will not give up the use of the Prayer Book or discard any of the doctrines held in the Anglican Churches. Yet the united Church in South India will not itself be an Anglican Church: it will be a distinct Province of the Universal Church. It will have a very real intercommunion with the Churches of the Anglican Communion, though for a time that intercommunion will be limited in certain directions by their rules. Its Bishops will be received as Bishops by these Churches. Its episcopally ordained ministers—a continually increasing number—will be entitled under the usual rules to administer the Communion in the Churches of the Anglican Communion. Its communicants will be entitled to communicate with the Churches of the Anglican Communion, except in cases forbidden by the rules of these Churches. On the other hand no right to minister in the Churches of that Communion will be acquired by those ministers who have not been episcopally ordained.

"The fact that the Church in South India will not be a member of the group of Churches called the Anglican Communion will inevitably impose on our brethren a temporary severance of close and treasured relationships, in council and synod, with their brethren in North India. But these are sacrifices which we believe they will make cheerfully in the hope of achieving a union between Episcopal and non-Episcopal churches such as has never yet been effected, and of building up a real and living Church in India. For our part we assure our brethren that they will never be disowned nor deserted by the Anglican Communion. It will preserve for them unimpaired their welcome to its love and fellowship, to its altars and its pulpits. For it will be looking forward to the day when their work will be rewarded and the unity of these Churches, not only in South India but in the whole of India, will be completed, and there will emerge a Province of Christ's Church, genuinely Catholic, loyal to all truth, within whose visible unity treasures of faith and order, nowhere in the Church at present combined, will be possessed in common, and the power of Christ will be manifest in a new richness.

"It was with unanimity and with profound sense of thankfulness that the Conference adopted the Resolutions relating to South India.

. . . .

"Though in other directions, and especially in our relations with the non-Episcopal Churches of our various countries, no such measurable advance can be recorded, we feel that the aspirations of the last Lambeth Conference have not failed, but are standing the strain of the attempt to translate words into action. In addition to delegations from Episcopal Churches other than those which we have mentioned, our Committee had the privilege of receiving and conferring with distinguished representatives of the now happily united Church of Scotland and of the Evangelical Free Churches of England. It was with renewed hope of progress that the Conference decided to invite these non-Episcopal Churches to enter into full conference with us once more. Further, it adopted unanimously a resolution in favor of 'efforts of Evangelism in co-operation with Christians of other Communions,' believing that, while the leaders discuss the still unsolved problems of Church order, the rank and file may be brought to closer mutual understanding through united public witness to those truths of our faith which we rejoice to know we hold in common. May God reinforce the impulse which He gave ten years ago with courage, wisdom and love to pursue the quest of the visible unity of the whole Church of Christ."

Indeed, may it not well be that the "rank and file" of plain, everyday Christians may in other places, as well as in India, help in "the still unsolved problems of Church order"? As has been observed elsewhere in this volume, the rank and file who are not ecclesiasticians and theologians have been overlooked, and it may be that they can contribute something to our considerations if given a chance. We may well believe that the time is not far distant when that section of the Lambeth encyclical which deals with "spiritual reality" will be largely divested of its qualifications in relation to forms of belief and order. Each succeeding message appears to indicate progress toward this end.

Again, however, as has been observed with relation to the Protestant Episcopal Church, the unity of the Anglican with the Protestant bodies is far from being as simple a question as it is where any two or more of the distinctively Protestant bodies are concerned. Indeed, this leads again to the question as to whether or not it would be wise for the strictly Protestant churches to unite and then assume a less organic federated relation with the Anglican and Eastern churches. For this reason therefore the Anglican brethren should be hesitant in taking a hostile or censorious attitude toward what they term pan-Protestantism.

There is opportunity for far more mutually sympathetic spirit and patience in all discussions between the Anglican and distinctively Protestant bodies and, as has been already suggested, union is not likely to be hastened, as has sometimes been attempted, by an attitude of defiance on the part of Protestant and extremely liberal Anglicans, in violation of the customs and ecclesiastical rules of order of the Anglican Church. Even the permissible principle of "local adaptation" may be invoked in such manner as to incite dissension.

The Anglican communion is, partly unconsciously, finding its way into the great world federal movement. While the writer is profoundly persuaded that there are no real obstacles to intercommunion, he feels that we may well await further mutual understanding rather than to force a unity resting upon an outward symbol, without inward spiritual content. Meanwhile, the Anglican Church has sought union between itself, the Eastern churches and the Old Catholic Church on the one hand and has at the same time invited conference with the Free Churches of Great Britain on the other. And it should be added that, in some respects, the Free Churches have at some points been, as the French say, *intransigeant*.

Reunion of the Anglican and Eastern Orthodox churches is believed by a reliable authority, Dr. William C. Emhardt, to be a possibility of the near future and recent conversations would indicate that the Old Catholic Church is likely to be included. In 1931 representatives of the Old Catholic Churches and those of the Anglican Communion, agreed upon a concordat, each recognizing the catholicity and independence of the other, agreeing to reciprocal participation in the Sacraments, without requiring identity of doctrine, but implying that each believes the other to hold all essentials of the Christian faith. This has been accepted by the Church of England.

Looking in quite another direction, relations with the Church of Sweden (Lutheran) have gone so far as to include participation by English bishops in the consecration of Swedish bishops.

The strategic opportunity of the Anglican Church has been well interpreted by the Canon of Westminster, Dr. Percy Dearmer,[10] as revealed by the Lambeth Conference of 1930. It gave a "full recognition of other communions" and expressed the *desire* for "inter-communion." It approved the one united church in South India. Dr. Dearmer expresses the judgment that "the age of doctrinal unity has passed away," and its place has been taken by Christian worship. The organizational form of unity will be federal. This is illustrative of a rising generation of English church leaders.

THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCHES

One of the most striking phenomena of present-day Christianity is the emergence of the Orthodox Church of the East from a thousand years of exclusiveness and isolation into free and friendly contact with the other churches. This is significant, among other reasons, because the Orthodox churches comprise one hundred and fifty million communicants. The meaning of this has not yet been evaluated by the churches of the United States where branches of these churches have silently but rapidly increased. Approaches by Eastern churchmen toward the Protestant churches are not, however, entirely new. Professor Mihalcesco of the Theological Faculty of the University of Bucharest gives us a very interesting account of[11] the efforts of Patriarch Cyrille Lucaris, in the sixteenth century, to effect union with the Calvinists. He tells us that the Calvinists might well regard Cyrille as a martyr and refers to him as a "precursor of Eastern and Protestant reunion." Cyrille went so far as to prepare a common Confession, which was condemned.

---

[10] "The New Reformation: The Church of England and the Fellowship of the Churches" by Percy Dearmer. Oxford University Press.

[11] *"Les idées Calvinistes du patriarch Cyrille Lucaris." Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses.* November-December, 1931.

We have already indicated the attitude of these churches in our account of the Lausanne Conference of 1927. Their most hopeful relationship is with the Universal Christian Council on Life and Work, while the most important perhaps is with the International Missionary Council.

They, however, do not constitute an organizational whole and recent efforts to secure a united conference or council among themselves have thus far failed, but it is still envisaged.

The Roman Church has recently renewed its efforts to bring them into its fold.

While, as we see by their attitude at Lausanne, they may appear obstructive at the present moment, their old-time exclusiveness is rapidly giving way to the ecumenical spirit. Indeed, it may be said that the change of attitude on the part of these old historic bodies, in outlook and in their spirit, has perhaps been greater in the direction of progress than that of any other church bodies, speaking in relative terms. Their faces are toward the light. While at Lausanne they seemed to be a divisive influence, at Stockholm they were hearty and sympathetic.

Probably the most representative utterance of the Eastern Orthodox Church was that at Lausanne in 1927.[12] It calls attention to the significant fact that at Lausanne in 1920 the Orthodox delegates had proposed "a League of Churches," "for their moral cooperation in regard to the social and moral principles of Christendom." In sympathetic and irenic language, the message leads up to the conclusion that "the mind of the Orthodox Church is that *reunion* can take place only on the basis of the common faith and confession of the ancient, undivided Church of the seven Ecumenical Councils and of the first eight centuries." Agreement is expressed with the message of the Conference. Further than that "the most that we can do now is to enter into cooperation with other churches in the social and moral sphere on a basis of Christian love." In other words the Orthodox Church accepts the principle of federal unity, although with limitations. While therefore this message seems to sound a prohibitive note, it is really constructive and forward-looking in its implications.

---

[12] Appendix VII.

These churches have recently come into friendly relationship with the Federal Council in the United States, largely through the influence of the service in their midst by Near East Relief under the guidance of Dr. James L. Barton, Charles V. Vickrey and their associates. For a time the Federal Council had a representative, Dr. W. W. Peet, visiting among them. The Council also sent a messenger of relief, Dr. John S. Zelie, to the Russian Church, in time of famine. Their messengers from abroad and from their local bodies in the United States have participated in annual and quadrennial meetings of the Federal Council. In 1928 the General Secretary of the Council received a warm welcome from several which he visited in the Near East. The Council has provided scholarships for several of their students in our theological seminaries.

Partly as the result of these mutual approaches there is now a joint committee of representatives of American church bodies for the cultivation of these relationships and missionary interests.

One of the most encouraging signs of the times is the heartiness of Eastern Church leaders in their participation in the Universal Christian Council on Life and Work, their readiness to study the work of Western Christianity and their deepening interest in Christian Education and its social implications. The response to the invitation of the Federal Council to send their students to theological seminaries in the United States is an example of their attitude.

The time has come for a closer relationship between the Federal Council and the branches of these churches in the United States, and more especially their association with local councils and federations.

While any strictly organic union between these churches and Protestant bodies is very remote, they would bring a very valuable contribution to a federal union and one which the Protestant bodies need. They too, are looking toward the federal conception of Christian unity.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

The question may naturally be raised as to why this volume does not consider the possibility of union or reunion with the Roman Catholic Church. The answer is, first of all, that the most recent utterance from the Vatican[13] precludes such consideration. The Roman Catholic Church has declined, through the utterance of its infallible Pope, even to consider the question of unity at Stockholm and at Lausanne and has informed the churches that it can do so only on its own terms, namely, that all Christian bodies, not as such but as individuals, must simply return to its allegiance.

Moreover, it is obvious that the insistence of certain of the exponents of unity that it could be considered only with a view to what is termed reunion with the Roman Catholic Church has been a distinctively obstructive factor in the whole movement for unity.

It should be recalled that the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work conveyed by special messengers what constituted an invitation to the Pope to be represented at

---

[13] "The Light of Truth" by Pope Pius XI. National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1932.

Stockholm, which was, to all intents and purposes, rejected. Likewise, the Roman Catholic Church declined to be represented at the World Conference on Faith and Order.

Shortly after the Lausanne Conference in 1927 the Pope issued an encyclical letter intended to interpret the declination of the Roman Catholic Church to participate in the conference. A few quotations will indicate its meaning:

> "This being so, it is clear that the Apostolic See can by no means take part in these assemblies, nor is it in any way lawful for Catholics to give to such enterprises their encouragement or support. . . .
>
> "Furthermore, it is never lawful to employ in connexion with articles of faith the distinction invented by some between 'fundamental' and 'non-fundamental' articles, the former to be accepted by all, the latter being left to the free acceptance of the faithful. The supernatural virtue of faith has as its formal motive the authority of God revealing, and this allows of no such distinction. All true followers of Christ, therefore, will believe the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God with the same faith as they believe the mystery of the august Trinity, the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff in the sense defined by the Oecumenical Vatican Council with the same faith as they believe the Incarnation of our Lord. That these truths have been solemnly sanctioned and defined by the Church at various times, some of them even quite recently, makes no difference to their certainty, nor to our obligation of believing them. Has not God revealed them all? . . .
>
> "There is but one way in which the unity of Christians may be fostered, and that is by furthering the return to the one true Church of Christ of those who are separated from it; for from that one true Church they have in the past fallen away. . . .
>
> "Furthermore, in this one Church of Christ no man can be or remain who does not accept, recognize, and obey the authority and supremacy of Peter and his legitimate successors. . . .
>
> "You, Venerable Brethren, know how dear to Our heart is this desire, and We wish that our children also should know, not only those belonging to the Catholic fold, but also those separated from Us. If these will humbly beg light from heaven, there is no doubt but that they will recognize the one true Church of Jesus

> Christ, and entering therein, will at last be united with Us in perfect charity. In the hope of this fulfilment, and as a pledge of our fatherly good-will, We impart most lovingly to you, Venerable Brethren, and to your clergy and people, the Apostolic Benediction."

The more recent encyclical of Pope Pius XI, however, clarifies the situation. The occasion was the fifteenth centenary of the Ecumenical Council of Ephesus. In this pronouncement His Holiness appeals, with a certain customary indirectness, to all other so-called Christians and to those who govern separated flocks, to return to the one true Church of Christ.

Not only the Nestorians, who were cut off at Ephesus, but all others not now among the Roman Catholic faithful, are referred to in these plain terms:

> "So the heretics all, as withered branches severed from the divine vine, could not drink in the sap of life, nor produce fruit."

Following this far from persuasive introduction, His Holiness expresses his affection:

> "If the many who are separated from the Apostolic See, brothers and sons most dear to Us, being moved by the quest of truth, reflect and ponder . . . they cannot help being led by history as teacher of life and affected by the desire at least of one fold and one Shepherd, to embrace the true faith which is ever kept sound and entire in the Roman Church. In the process which the Fathers of the Council of Ephesus followed . . . three dogmas of the Catholic religion, which We shall treat principally, shine forth with brilliancy in the eyes of all; namely, that the person of Jesus Christ is one and divine; that the Blessed Virgin Mary should be acknowledged and venerated by everyone as really and truly the Mother of God; *and that when matters of faith or morals are concerned the Roman Pontiff has from on high an authority which is supreme above all others and subject to none."* [13a]

The conditions of "reunion" are thus explicit and final, and they are final because they are set down by an infallible authority.

[13a] In quoting this document, the italics are the author's.

To be sure, just which was the initial and initiating authority, the Council of Ephesus or the Pope Celestine, is not clear, inasmuch as the latter, following the Council, "solemnly condemned the errors *found by a synodal examination* and decreed that they should be condemned by all." However, "in doing this, the Roman Pontiff did not leave to the arbitration of the Council the case as if undecided, but firmly adhering to 'what has already been decided by Us,' he ordered the Council to execute the sentence imposed by him."

The arguments in the encyclical on "acceptance of Papal authority" in this connection are quite beyond at least the average human mind. The Pope ordered the Council as to the action it should take. The Council considered it, took the action, and then the Pope approved it. Finally, "the Pontiff Celestine, with the Council of Ephesus, guarded (both) the ancient doctrine and the supreme authority of the Apostolic See." The judge gave orders to the jury, the jury conferred or counselled, approved the mandate of the judge, who then approved the decision of the Council.

But "it is otherwise among those who wander most pitiably outside the one fold of Christ," although "still bearing the honored name of Christian." "Hence it appears clearly that *all these* . . . therefore, according to the Apostle John, *are not of God.*" "Let them remember that this genuine unity of the faith rests and stands only on the one rock set by Christ, and further that it has been preserved safe and secure *by the supreme authority of the successors of Blessed Peter.*"

Thus we have the first indispensable condition of "reunion," acknowledgment of Papal sovereignty and infallibility. So much is clear.

But there is another. "From this principle of Catholic doctrine . . . there necessarily follows the dogma of the divine motherhood which we predicate of the Blessed Virgin Mary." "We should venerate her, love her ardently, and, by imitating her most holy example, *endeavor to obtain her powerful patronage.*" Thus "let us trust to her confidently all that is ours—joys if we rejoice, woes if we are in trial, hopes if we endeavor to rise to better things." Still further, "let us have recourse to her, begging help from heaven; in the supreme trial of death, when all hope, all help is gone, let us lift up our eyes in tears and trembling, imploring through her pardon from her Son and eternal joy in heaven." In any time of disaster she is the medium of help.

On these two conditions, Papal authority and prayer to the Virgin Mary, Pope Pius XI bases his "plea for unity," urging that seekers for unity "all go to her and with supplication beg earnestly that by interceding with her Son the erring nations may return to Christian principles and precepts." Thus "under the auspices of the heavenly Queen" . . . may they (the people of the East) not be permitted by her to "be unhappily wandering and still kept apart from the unity of the Church and thus from her Son, whose Vicar on earth We are." "May they return *to the Father* whose judgment the Fathers of the Council of Ephesus accepted so reverently and whom they all saluted as 'guardian of the faith.' "

The encyclical, at its close, returns to Mary; "Would, moreover, that very soon the happiest of days might dawn when the Virgin Mother of God, looking out through her image so exquisitely worked in mosaic under Our Predecessor Sixtus III in the Liberian Basilica, and restored by Us to its original beauty, would see the separated children returning to venerate her with Us, with one mind and faith." The encyclical closes with orders for "a Mass and Office of the Divine Maternity to be celebrated by the Universal Church."

Let us hope that Pius XI has at last simplified the question of Christian unity, both for himself and for all others who bear the Christian name, but who "are not of God," and has made their course clear and unimpeded by the problem of "reunion."

This appeal for unity says nothing about the Holy Spirit as a guide to all truth. The only exhortation to prayer is that those separated from the church shall seek the intervention of Mary.

That the Pope is concerned about recent conferences on Christian unity is evident. His greatest concern is the participation of the Eastern churches in these conferences, and there is evident effort in this message to dissuade them from continuing such associations.

Surely, it may now be hoped that men who have delayed the unity of non-Catholic Christians by this hope of Roman inclusion will no longer persist in continuing an obstructive course, except those who are ready to accept the doctrine of Papal infallibility and offer their prayers to Mary. Thus the Pope may have furthered the real and living unity so devoutly sought.

The attitude of Pius XI is further made clear by his recent command that all "mixed marriages" shall be Roman Catholic marriages and by his warning a few years ago against Catholic coöperation with those of other faiths in social welfare. The course of self-respecting Protestant and all non-Catholic Christians is clear; to cease the discussion of *re*union, take a sympathetic and friendly attitude toward their Catholic brethren, coöperate heartily with them, when permitted, in works of human love and mercy, but to unite, themselves, and no longer permit overtures to Rome to delay or obstruct their progress. Much will be gained if this question is no longer agitated, and the mutual friendliness of Protestant and Catholic will, above all, be deepened by a mutual sense of self-respect. In fact, the constant efforts for *re*union have driven Catholic and Protestant further apart, and thus have hindered and delayed union and unity. It is surely time that

Protestants and Eastern churchmen should be as open and frank on this question as the Pope has been, barring his near approach to anathemas. Those who seek unity by the analogy of Rome can find it only by Rome's method, that of submissive conformity and the entire relinquishment of liberty in either thinking or living. Those who seek unity with the Roman Church may have it only under her conditions.

There are, moreover, differences on ethical questions and practical morals, especially in the United States, some of which have recently been the subject of discussion. These include such questions as Sunday observance, temperance, education, the marital relations, the subject of mixed marriages and many other similar matters of living. On some of these there has been an approach to regrettable acrimonious discussion. One outstanding difference is that on the question of relation between Church and State. One of the broadest, most liberal and highly respected Roman Catholic priests in the United States has frankly expressed his desire and hope that that nation may become so predominantly Roman Catholic as to establish a state religion.[14] These problems are multitudinous. For example, the Roman Catholic hierarchy was obliged to decline to unite with the Protestant and Hebrew participants in the ceremonies incident to the burial of the Unknown Soldier.

What then should be the relation of Protestant and Roman Catholic citizens? The Protestant bodies, notably the Federal Council, have manifested warm desire for coöperative relations. The Federal Council has rebuked anti-Catholic propaganda, while at the same time expressing itself freely but irenically on the subject of mixed marriages.

The obvious course is indicated by the seminars of the National Conference on Jews and Christians, where frank and friendly discussion of common social and civic interests is carried on between Protestants, Catholics and Jews. The Commission on the Church and Social Service and the Department of Research of the Federal Council have made studies together with Roman Catholic social agencies, and issued joint reports and expressions of moral judgment on social and industrial questions. International peace is an obvious common objective. The writer served for several years with Hon. Morgan J. O'Brien as a joint chairman in arranging facilities for religious broadcasting. In these and other ways the public welfare may be coöperatively served. Let us have as much of this as possible. This is the kind of unity without which the nation would suffer. We may therefore hope that its continuance may be possible, together with the utmost liberty of judgment on ecclesiastical questions.

---

[14] On this subject, see "The State and The Church," by John A. Ryan and M. F. X. Millar. Macmillan.

CONCLUSION

It may be that this chapter will seem confusing, but let it be remembered that we are dealing here with a multitude of divergent human factors which are seeking to adjust themselves to an irresistible spirit of unity. It is much the same problem that faces the nations in the League of Nations. We shall attempt, in our closing chapters, to indicate, not perhaps the ultimate future, for unity like all great ideals is a receding goal. We may be able, however, to reveal the path of advance for the immediate future of the Christian churches, other than that of Rome, and in any event to point out the course to be followed by the Protestant churches of the United States.

CHAPTER XI

THE PATH OF ADVANCE

The Christian churches are already in that path and have advanced no inconsiderable distance. It has been by normal and natural processes. There has been no autocratic superimposition of a preconceived scheme. It has been an outward embodiment of inward realities rather than of traditional formulas. Both diversity and liberty have found expression. Existing institutions have not been destroyed but fulfilled. The advance has been a natural one without artificial conformity to an exact pattern. Organization has been adjusted to the needs of the hour—there is no other excuse for organization. Simplicity, which is ever essential to universality, has characterized the intellectual background of this advance and thus it has been inclusive and accumulative rather than narrowly bound by limitations. The functions of the whole have not paralyzed the activities of the several parts. It has been positive and not negative in expressing common convictions.

No goal has been reached. The future is but an enlarging of the past. The kind of union which will express our unity is being discovered through experience. Christian union is not going to come full grown through the discussion of it, but by development, through the continued practice of it. We must go ahead from the point where we are. The historical sections of this volume make it clear that these considerations must be our guide. The conclusion is based on these verifiable assumptions. Our present federal unity needs but expansion and coördination.

The movement for unity in the United States and similarly in other nations is now so interrelated with the world movement that they act and react upon one another. One has only to read and interpret the messages of the Universal Christian Council for Life and Work, the World Conference on Faith and Order and the International Missionary Council to be persuaded that in spirit, purpose and service the Christian forces of mankind have an essential unity in the presence of which their real differences become almost negligible. The question is how to assume an organizational form that will conserve the liberty which is the fundamental element in the teaching of Jesus, and thus allow for the diversity which it requires. How far is uniformity essential to unity? How may these several tides and expressions of unity find their way into one channel? How may the diverse views of what constitutes unity be simplified so that unity may not itself continue to preclude or hinder unity? Can our present organizational multiplicity be simplified and coördinated? How may our attained union in service reveal its own background of spirit and life in God through Jesus Christ, which is its profounder motive? We have discovered, or are discovering, that our choice is not between creeds and forms, but between a world of irreligion and a world of faith, in Jesus' use of that word. Our differences in religious experience are little more than temperamental. These, like our faith, worship and service, have been divisive only by our varying theories or modes of expression of things essentially one.

In the closing chapters the author trusts that he may not be either dogmatic or oversubjective. He hopes that he may exercise as much objectivity as is humanly possible, and yet of course he cannot be entirely detached from an experience of more than forty years of interest in Christian unity or more particularly from nearly a quarter of a century of intimate study and of relationship to this movement, in intimate touch with every type and temperament of Christian organization. He has made it clear that at least the prevailing tendency in the minds of Christian men and women is toward the federal conception and that, whatever the distant future may have in store, the immediate possibilities for unity are at hand and those who see a vision of something farther ahead must give their hearts and souls to what is now possible. The main reason for any lack of progress in the advance of federal unity has been the divided forces among those who believe in Christian unity.

There are two problems in our quest for unity, the one institutional and the other that of institutional content. We shall consider both, as they relate to the churches of the United States and of the world.

In the United States

That the movement for Christian unity in the United States has found its way into federal form there can be no question. The chief need of the moment is to unify the *disjecta membra* of federal unity itself. Dr. H. Paul Douglass of the Institute of Social and Religious Research is now engaged on an inquiry among representative pastors, administrators and laymen, to ascertain the extent of their desire for union and their preferential form. So far as the United States is concerned, the latter is clear enough. The chief value of this study will be the amount of real and deep understanding, interest and desire which it may reveal. The report of progress on returns of about seven thousand responses is of significance, as the constituency making them included bodies not predisposed to unity, such as the Lutheran and Baptist South. Thirty-two per cent favored federal union, thirty-two per cent union "in one church," while twenty-nine per cent would "continue the present system of separate denominations," the latter being predominantly from Lutheran, Presbyterian South and Baptist South membership. Thus sixty-four per cent at least desire union of some form. Little significance should be accorded the division on form of union, as most people do not discriminate very much as to method of organization. Those who want union "in one church" mean to say that they want all the unity possible.

On the question as to whether or not related denominations should unite, nine out of every ten votes were favorable. Geographically, the South is nearly twice as strong for strict denominational continuance as the West. The Northeast is the stronghold of federal preference.

Any interpretation of these and the further results from this inquiry, now substantiating the first summary, should await the completed study, but there is little doubt that these figures, in a general way, express the mind of both ministers and laymen. Denominationally, they appear to reflect the denominational attitudes as described elsewhere in this volume.

As one considers what would have been the probable response to such proposals fifty or even twenty-five years ago, his heart may well be strengthened. Indeed, were the Lutheran and Southern Baptist elements not counted, the preference for any exact denominational persistence would be relatively slight.

It is mainly the organizational difficulties and differences, perhaps together with those of personal and temperamental nature, which prevent the Federal Council and the several organizations representing the federated boards from uniting under the general principle of federal unity. Indeed, it may be said that, partly consciously and partly unconsciously, the various federated bodies named in the introduction to this volume are finding their way together. The Federal Council, which now includes these organizations as corresponding members, is a symbol and symptom of the ultimate unity of these bodies. It can be effected without any over-centralized authority and may provide for autonomy and liberty. The experience of the last two or three years in the coöperative relation between the Home Missions Councils and the Federal Council is illustrative of the possibilities of this larger unity. We need not be concerned about the form of organization. The Federal Council, the correlating center or main stream of federal unity, has a flexible constitution. The present tenuous relation between the federated boards and the Council is not adequate. The executive staffs, above all, need to form a common body for constant consultation. In other words our present federal unity needs to become more actually and completely federalized. Perhaps the most speedy and effective method of bringing this about would be the assembling of these various bodies in one common headquarters. This was the experience of the Federal Council and the two Home Missions Councils. One of the author's as yet unfulfilled dreams is that of a national Christian headquarters where the church and interchurch bodies would be at work, side by side, six days a week. It would be a saving of time and money and would ultimately bring about the inward unity of which it would be the outward symbol.

We have often assumed that certain issues must be settled before groups could unite which, as a matter of fact, can never be settled until after they are united, or at least constantly together. To bring about this larger unity the main channel needs enlargement and even reconstruction.

The problem of voluntary organizations has its perplexities. There probably never will be a time when groups of Christians will not exercise their freedom to do the work of the church for it rather than to serve in its institutional agencies. The question might be raised, however, as to how far it is wise for the churches to endorse and support agencies over which they have no control or only indirect or remote influence. In any event, Christian societies looking for and requiring the support of the churches might well accept an operating coöperative relationship to them, and thus further the unifying of our Christian forces and institutions. Such a body, for example, as the Salvation Army, should be included.

There is especial need for a much clearer understanding between the Young Men's Christian Association and the Young Women's Christian Association and the united churches. If these associations are to be recognized as real representatives of the churches there should be some adjustment between the governing bodies of the two. If the associations are to continue as purely voluntary agencies, then the present consultative relationship needs to be greatly deepened and should no longer be dissociated from the Federal Council. The same is true regarding other semi-voluntary bodies which depend upon the churches and are approved by them. That there are other independent agencies which ought to be merged with the Federal Council there is little question, except by those whose organizational consciousness has caused them to lose perspective. The field needs clearing up in the interest of both economy and effectiveness.

Up to the present time the constituent bodies of the Federal Council have not been integrated to anything near their full extent. They are still acting independently in many areas of service and by many methods where united action would not only be more effective in realizing federal unity, but would tend to the enlargement of the life and vision and the increase of the effectiveness of their own churches. In other words they would save their lives in losing them.

The same thing is true of the local churches in relation to the local councils, as Dr. H. Paul Douglass has so convincingly shown. There must be more simplification, by reducing organization, with coöperative concentration. A recent study,[1] in this field, for example, recommends the merging of Councils of Religious Education and Church Councils, as a "paramount necessity." Religious education is inseparably related to all the other tasks of the church. The authors of this volume urge a like "unity in structure," with centralized government.[2]

The early future should thus bring a clearer articulation of federal unity, increasing unity within itself, the gradual assumption of more administrative tasks and the consequent enlargement of its organic character, but still guided and controlled by the constituent elements. It must be admitted that the several federated bodies representing departments and boards of the churches, as now constituted, also duplicate each other's work, and there are many departments like that of research, for example, which ought to function for all of them. There is no question but what the constituent bodies of the Federal Council might at once release certain phases and areas of their service to be prosecuted by the Federal Council, and this could be done with denominational supervision because those responsible for it in the denominations would be made the directors of such common work.

But there is, as we have seen, another recent development to be considered, namely the Community Church. This movement has cut across the lines of nationally and denominationally regulated Christian organization. For a time the denominational authorities largely ignored it, occasionally approving instances where it was obvious and inevitable, but more often discouraging it. It has now, however, reached their consciousness and we may well look to the recently formed Joint Committee of the Federal Council, the Home Missions Council and the Community Church workers, first to prevent this significant movement from becoming just another denomination, but still more to help adjust it to the life of the churches as a whole.

---

[1] "Community Organization in Religious Education," by Hugh Hartshorne and J. Q. Miller. Yale University Press, 1932.

[2] The Church Council and the Council of Religious Education of Connecticut have recently united.

With the rapid growth of large numbers of new communities, some independent and some existing as sections of large cities, we have a splendid chance for real statesmanship and for the exercise of the spirit and practice of comity. In any event the very existence of these churches, their rapid increase and their relative unconcern as to previous individual denominational attachments, offer abundant evidence of the existing spirit of unity among the unofficial element of our Christian constituency. The increasing readiness of several of the larger denominational bodies to cultivate such churches, offer them a channel for their larger missionary interests, and at the same time give them ample freedom, is a very hopeful sign. It is, in the judgment of the author, to be regretted that in occasional instances, these churches have not found their way into membership in local councils. As a general rule, at least, this would be a short-sighted policy. Thus far, federation has developed from the top down. This should be increasingly reversed. While over-standardization should be avoided, there is need of closer relationship between national, state and local bodies.

Among other problems, there are altogether too many approaches from national centers, denominational, interdenominational and voluntary, to the local field and churches.

Attention is frequently called to the two hundred and more denominations in the United States.[8] This is misleading, a large number of them being negligible in numbers. As a matter of fact about one hundred and fifty are in twenty-three families and there are only about forty of what we should consider major bodies. Generally there are very few in any one locality. The problem of unity is not so hopeless as a superficial glance at the census would appear to indicate.

---

[8] "Religious Bodies 1926"—U. S. Census Bureau.

Indeed, federal unity may readily become federal union, following the analogy of the government of the United States, with such increasingly organic solidarity as experience may lead to.[4] While the moderation exercised in the earlier formative years of the Federal Council has proved to be real wisdom, this deliberateness must not take the form of *laissez faire*. The churches are ready for a courageous advance and are less likely to respond to half-heartedness than they would be to a sober fearlessness and faith such as characterized the councils of 1905 and 1908. The letter of the Constitution of the Federal Council should not be invoked to suppress its spirit. The future of unity in the United States rests, or should rest, largely with the fulfillment of the proposals of the Committee on Function and Structure of the Federal Council. The Council's Committee dealing with worship and the devotional life may also become a vital factor in the world-wide search for unity in faith and order.

The Federal Council and the associated federated boards have passed the age of mere experiment. The time has ceased for scrupulous distinction between "coöperation" and "unity." The men who instituted the Federal Council in 1905 and 1908 builded better than they knew. Their latent or inherent philosophy is now emerging to view. They were prophets who acted from an insight into the new demands of the Gospel. Their genius was that defined by Carlyle, "co-operation with the real tendency of the world." In finding the path of federal unity they were but moving along with the trend, the necessary trend of the age. Religious unity was taking the same course as unity in the social order and in political affairs. Indeed, they were pursuing the same path that the denominations were following. The Anglican and Eastern Orthodox churches are closely federated rather than organically one. The Lutheran churches are federally associated. Presbyterian and Reformed and other less closely organized church bodies were uniting, to either lesser or greater degrees, in federal forms. All these bodies have been following the lines of social advance in all spheres of life, economic, political and cultural.

---

[4] "The Challenge of Change," by John Milton Moore—Council of Women for Home Missions, 1931. Dr. Moore has rendered material service to Christian unity in various ways, especially in the later re-thinking on the problems involved.

A word should be said about personnel. The first body which had the courage or foresight to name women as members of the Federal Council was the Five Year Meeting of Friends. There has been a gradual increase in the number of women in the Council, its Executive and Administrative Committees and its several departments. It is high time that more equality of representation should be the rule. This, however, takes us back to the constituent denominations where similar progress is being made, but none too speedily. A woman should, in the judgment of the author, be added as a General Secretary of the Federal Council, and its departments should likewise have women on their staffs other than as clerks or assistants. As has already been intimated, there is also need of a larger proportion of laymen in the Council's personnel and our Christian youth are abundantly needed, not only in detached voluntary bodies, such as the United Society of Christian Endeavor, but within the churches as such. They need to be in close association with church unity in the Federal Council.

But the denominationally conscious readers may ask: What will ultimately happen to our denomination? While this is for the present a remote question, some answers may be anticipated. That the constituent bodies of the Federal Council are amenable to federal unity, both nationally and regionally, has been demonstrated by experience. The future is largely dependent on their closer federation and union in local areas. In almost any one of these areas there are relatively few denominations. Just as they have been brought into increasing national unity in what may be termed their occupational or service interests, so these same matters of common welfare are gradually bringing them closer together in community fellowship and service. Opportunities for local organic union are abundant.

We may further inquire how far distinct denominational traits can survive federal unity? The answer is, just so far as they have religious or social values. Some of them, born of conditions not now existing, have long been almost negligible. The next generation may lose many more denominational distinctions. No true loyalty will continue to divide the body of Christ. Indeed, denominational loyalties on the less important symbols are rapidly disappearing.

Even more pronounced differences, as for example, that between ritual and informal method of worship, may lose significance in time. Who can tell?

When, however, we come to those elements which are decidedly temperamental, the mystical in contrast to the objective sacramental for example, these traits will doubtless always exist and federal unity allows for them. It may be assumed that no denomination would ever be called upon to relinquish any custom or idea which is religiously and socially helpful. Denominational values will be all the more clearly preserved when denominational impediments disappear.

Again, we need not anticipate problems, but have faith that, as in the past, experience in fellowship will continue to be our guide. Faith, said the Master, would remove mountains. In any event, most of these remoter questions will fall to succeeding generations and nobody knows what new discoveries of unity they may make, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, which can even change human nature.

Federal unity, as expressed in Federal Councils, must rapidly become something more than a common social approach and must modify, or rather counterbalance, some present near-humanistic tendencies, through a unified assurance of spiritual experience and its reality, expressed in terms of faith and worship. The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and the Universal Christian Council for Life and Work need to find something that carries the movement for federal unity a great deal deeper than its present pragmatic state. There should be an attempt to formulate the verities and the realities of Christian experience, which is the real basis of faith, when we use that word in the sense in which Jesus used it. It is of interest to note that quite recently the Federal Council has initiated conference with its constituent bodies on the development of the devotional life and the spirit of worship. The Council has thus been finding its way into the deeper life of churches and Christians. Its "Fellowship of Prayer" during the Lenten season has been followed by a rapidly increasing number of churches and people. To be sure this is less easy to define than adherence or submission to a creed just because it is so universal. We realize, however, that the impulsion of a holy feeling is more real than the recital of a dogma or doctrine. We must be guarded, however, in these more introspective extensions of federal functions. Jesus proclaimed a fundamentally social gospel. It was not without deep religious significance that the Federal Council was born, either of or on a wave of the sense of social righteousness. Christian unity cannot live in an unsocialized society—nor can Christianity live either.

Function and Structure of the Federal Council

The denominational bodies in the United States are hard pressed. They need a leadership that is morally and spiritually commanding, a coöperative rather than individual guidance. Not only for their future progress, but to conserve what has been already secured through coöperation, the opportunity and responsibility of the Federal Council need extension and larger amplitude, otherwise there is grave danger of defeatism. Reaction toward sectarian denominationalism is not the way of salvation for denominational values and service. Like the Briand-Kellogg Pact the Federal Council requires implementing.

The bodies federating the boards of the churches need also an enlargement of channel in the development of a deeper common spiritual life. Unified administration is of value but is not profound enough to meet its own objectives. All that has been said with reference to the Federal Council applies equally to them.

Since the foregoing and all the other sections of this volume were written the Federal Council has proceeded toward enlarging the content of federal unity relative to its own function and structure, and has provided for it by organizational changes more closely integrating its constituent elements, in such manner that the council may act both representatively and without abortive delay.

Just as at Lausanne there were ardent spirits who went away in disappointment because provision for organic union was not accomplished in a few days, so there were anxious souls at the Quadrennial meeting of December, 1932, at Indianapolis, who felt that little had been done. There will be others, looking on from the outside, who will complain because a beginning was made without completion of the task then and there. On the other hand, there are doubtless those who will be fearful of superimposition and lordship on the part of the Council. True to its genius and spirit, the Council still pursues the ever sure path of education, conference, persuasion and growth. One may, however, read much between the lines of its actions, indicating the possibility of almost unlimited progress. This being so, it is well to let the constituent elements have time to think and counsel, without hurry and haste.

At the same time, while it is the part of wisdom for those directing the Council to allow for thought and conference, it would be sad to have this confidence violated by denominational procrastination. The Foreign Missions Inquiry, to be referred to farther on, ought to be a warning against such a course. Whatever we may say of that inquiry, many of its just criticisms would not have been needed had the responsible agencies been fully alive to the possibilities inherent in united thinking, policy and practice. The writer might say, by way of parenthesis, that he has seen many another such instance. May the constituent bodies be as prompt in realizing the situation as the Council was patient in allowing time for them to confer and pray upon it. Sympathetic counsel and prayer are needed rather than the kind of debate that so often characterizes ecclesiastical assemblies. Indeed, one often wishes that the method of the Quakers might be more often employed.

If there is response to the Federal Council's modestly suggested but obvious overtures on the part of the constituent communions and of the interboard agencies, the federal movement will, in its next quarter century, go far toward fulfilling the ideals of this volume, and will justify its prediction that federal and organic union are finding their way into an enlarged federal conception. First of all, the Council, in its Indianapolis report, dispelled the sometimes assumed theory that it had no deeper motive than that of doing things together. It has "a distinct and fundamental spiritual purpose" which "should never be forgotten." It is "an agency dealing first of all and last of all with the deep religious issues by which and for which the churches exist."

"In the varied work of the Council, five major emphases may be distinguished as having been most characteristic during the twenty-four years since its foundation:

"Promoting the spirit of unity through the provision of constant opportunities for contact and fellowship between representatives of the different communions both on a national scale and in the local community, and also during recent years in the international field.

"Facilitating the coördination of denominational programs and the practice of coöperation in various fields of activity. . . .

"Providing a voice through which the common convictions of the churches may be brought to bear effectively in molding public opinion on contemporary social and international issues in which Christian moral principles are at stake.

"Gathering and interpreting the relevant data which must underlie and justify any pronouncements of the Council so that they may be in conformity with the facts.

"Serving as an administrative agent of the churches in certain tasks for which no other agency is available. . . ."

"Further problems as to the functions of the Federal Council in the Christian movement as a whole have been created, or intensified, by the fact that during the twenty-four years since the Council was founded a number of different movements or trends have arisen that render the situation more complex than it was when the Council was founded. Among these may be mentioned:

"The formation by the churches constituent to the Council of a group of organizations paralleling and in the main independent of the Council through which, if desired, some of the objectives sought by the creation of the Council can be effected (e.g., the Federation of Woman's Boards of Foreign Missions, the Home Missions Council, the Council of Women for Home Missions, the International Council of Religious Education and the Council of Church Boards of Education).

"The rise of many local and state federations of churches as autonomous and independent units (in a few cases embracing bodies not constituent to the Council) as well as the emergence of a number of community churches with no, or only a slight, denominational connection.

"The rise, in various denominations, of commissions or similar bodies carrying on conferences or negotiations concerning union with certain other denominations, these commissions in some cases being separate from and unrelated to the groups in the same denomination dealing with responsibilities for coöperation and federation.

"The development of two rather distinct (though not necessarily exclusive) conceptions of the meaning of church unity—one emphasizing agreement in doctrine and organization, the other emphasizing practical coöperation and fellowship in the sphere of Christian life and work."

The judgment is recorded that "the churches may wisely recognize the Council as an agency which may perform administrative functions requested by the constituent bodies." There is found a strong conviction among the churches that there should be "some more effective integration of the Federal Council with the coöperative agencies in the field of religious education and foreign missions," such as has been effected with the Home Missions Council.

Attention is called to the fact that the churches, in their united capacity, must not only be concerned with their internal problems, remembering that there are multitudes outside all the Christian churches. Therefore responsibility must be more largely assumed for—

"Evangelizing the unchurched.
"Cultivating the devotional life.
"Furthering Christian education and nurture in the widest sense.
"Securing common action by the churches for the removal of the causes of such evils as social and racial injustice, unemployment and war, and for the development of a more Christian social and international order."

"The Council should now greatly magnify its function in the fields of evangelism, worship and Christian nurture. By exercising a more pronounced leadership in these fields it will fulfil more specifically the first three objectives outlined in its Constitution:

"To express the fellowship and catholic unity of the Christian Church.
"To bring the Christian bodies of America into united service for Christ and the world.

> "To encourage devotional fellowship and mutual counsel concerning the spiritual life."

The immediate need of the extension of coöperation in state and local areas, with its closer association in the national body, is urged. The Council is convinced that it must maintain a "thoroughly representative character," with full liberty for the same difference and discussion which obtains within the church bodies composing it. There are two distinct functions in the field of public opinion:

> "That of moral witness on issues in which there is enough of common mind to make a pronouncement possible.
>
> "That of education through study and frank discussion and publication of the results on issues in which we face a divided opinion."

Decisions on such issues can by no means always await slow action by denominational bodies. There must be "chief reliance" "in the representatives whom the churches themselves choose to serve upon the council." "The future of the Council will depend in the last analysis upon the character" of these representatives and their ability to meet frequently.

On the subject of "Church Union":

> "God through Christ by His word and spirit *creates* Christian unity in ways often beyond our comprehension. The function of the Federal Council is to help the churches to *express* the inner unity already existing and to foster spiritual conditions out of which a closer union of churches may naturally come. This was one of the original aims of the Council and ought now to have fresh emphasis.
>
> "The Federal Council promotes the expression of Christian unity in practical forms: (1) by the regular assembling and fellowship in council of representatives of the churches of the same and of different faith and order; (2) by leading them to work together in a living fellowship at tasks which we all agree are common to all of Christ's people: (3) by mutual acquaint-

ance of ministers and members of the churches through common worship, discussion, counsel and action.

"When the question is asked whether the Federal Council should encourage, by direct action in one way or another, organic union among the churches, there are divergent replies. Some hold that the Council should issue a clear and positive pronouncement favoring organic union. Others urge that it should at least provide for the establishment of a commission which would keep in touch with the various forms of church union that are now proposed or are in process throughout the world, through tracts and reports keep the churches informed of these movements, and be prepared to render aid, if requested, to such communions as are about to enter upon negotiations for union. There are still others, however, who are of the conviction that the Federal Council will most effectively promote union by continuing its functions on the basis of its present Constitution; that the original and present primary function of the Council is to enable different churches, while retaining their identity, to coöperate in work that is common to all of them. Those who take this view would generally agree with the others that, in the performance of its functions as originally defined, the Council should always be disposed in a friendly way toward negotiations for organic union arising in two or more churches."

The Department of Research and Education is requested to gather continuous information on movements for cooperation and union throughout the world to assist those bodies mutually seeking union.

As has been observed, these actions reveal an inner knowledge of the forces to be dealt with which can hardly be comprehended by casual observers. The way is now opened for the exercise of statesmanship by the denominational and interdenominational bodies, to become effective through a federal union which provides both liberty and unity. The implications of these principles may well be considered by all who seek Christian unity, whose objectives thus far have seemed to divide them in their very search for it.

There is, however, little use in setting forth ideals unless provision is made for their realization. Therefore it is proposed that the Council as a whole shall meet oftener, reduce its number, provide for longer terms of membership, reduce the number of its departments,[5] and unify more closely its constituent bodies in constant consultation and action. Thus the path of federal unity has been both simplified and enlarged.

The Committee on Function and Structure presented a supplementary study, containing the following significant interpretations of federal unity:

> "There can be no real federation which does not affect the actual status of the separate denominations, their relation to the whole, and to each other. This is of vital rather than of legal necessity. A creative contribution to a united church is to be made through the integrated functioning of the present churches. Logically, this involves some surrender of formal independence; but the real power and freedom of each unit is augmented rather than decreased by the unity of relationship into which all enter. Each denomination is more of an entity, more of a force, and has greater opportunity to make its distinctive contribution than it had before.
>
> "Such a result can only be reached through the continuous ongoing of a vital process of assimilation. This process must not be blocked by arbitrary taboos. All social analysis asserts that the greatest conscious agency of assimilation is discussion. Any inclination to say, 'No, we will not discuss this matter; this is a closed issue'; any attempt to compartmentalize discussion, like saying, 'We will talk together about the practical issues of the church's life and work, but we will not open the divisive question of faith and order' is to ignore the very first condition of making progress toward unity. If then any agency advocating federation or unity arbitrarily tries to stop the discussion at any given point—either through suppressive policy or through fear of consequences—that agency will have to be sidetracked for one in which free and full discussion can go on continuously.

---

[5] All forms of service to be comprehended under the following "Departments": Field (State and local federation); Evangelism; Church and Social Service; Race Relations; International Justice and Goodwill; Relations with Churches abroad; Research and Education; Radio.

"Finally, it must be clearly recognized that genuine federation means the commitment of substantial powers to the central organ of the federating elements. When no substantial powers are committed, or when powers are so shadowy and tenuous as not to allow the central organ to function as such, the conditions of genuine federation are not met."

In view of all these considerations, the Federal Council today calls for voluntary leadership, such as obtained in the days of its inception, men and women who not only have vision, but who, through their relationship with the constituent bodies, have the influence to secure its translation into action and who are willing, as were the men of 1905 and 1908, to keep close to the Council and give to it their thought and their time in the process of reconstruction and progress. It may well be hoped that such leadership will emerge under the impulse of new opportunity and obligation.

The Future of Unity in Foreign Missions

In his introduction the author has called for rethinking on the subject of Christian unity. Just as he had completed his own study, the results of the Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry were made known.[6]

Coincidently with the Federal Council's proposals for closer and more effective unity of its constituent and associated elements, the Laymen's Commission points out what it believes to be the path of advance in foreign missions. This is especially encouraging in view of the fact that the greater body of laymen have thus far given relatively little support or attention to the movement for church unity, either at home or abroad.

We have thus a striking reminder of the early prophecy of Richard Baxter that unity would come through foreign missions. In 1930, an organizationally detached corps of research workers[7] went to the Far Eastern fields of foreign missions to take account of their present service. This research body was for the purpose of gathering the relevant facts. During 1931 and 1932, an Appraisal Commission[8] went to the Far East to review the research studies, which were embodied in five volumes. The fields considered were India, Burma, China and Japan. Both the Commission and its sponsoring body were largely composed of men and women whose names would inspire no little confidence. Their report is now under consideration by the Foreign Missions Boards and has awakened deep interest and aroused animated discussion.

---

[6] "Re-Thinking Missions," edited by William Ernest Hocking, Harper & Bros., 1932.

This appraisal, as it is termed, and its sweeping proposals, are not matters to be decided and acted upon by a church conference as the resultant of an hour or two, or even a few days, of debate. They will require months and even years of both intensive study and testing in experience and it may well be hoped that the boards and the churches will not follow the all too frequent habit of precipitate ecclesiastical action, either in depreciation or acceptance of these proposals. They are susceptible of much interpretation and of many applications. In some instances the ideal, rather than the concrete plan, will need to be the basis of consideration.

It is not the purpose of the author of this volume to undertake this analysis, but simply to review the several judgments and recommendations of the Commission and then call attention to the one of them with which this volume is concerned. Whatever may eventuate regarding other objectives, their very consideration itself must bring about serious reconsideration of the unity of the churches and mission boards, both at home and in the field.

---

[7] Under the direction of the Institute of Social and Religious Research. Galen M. Fisher was General Director. The group in China was headed by H. Paul Douglass, that in India by C. Luther Fry, and that in Japan by Harvey H. Guy.

[8] It numbered fifteen, of whom one was a pastor, five were college or university officials, two of them being ordained ministers, a specialist in rural interests, two physicians, three business men and three women. Professor William E. Hocking was the Chairman. The inquiry was sponsored and financed by thirty-five laymen and women of seven communions—the Reformed Church in America, the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., the United Presbyterian, the Methodist Episcopal, the Congregational, the Protestant Episcopal and the Baptist.

The Commission courageously faces clearly stated questions: Have foreign missions finished their work? Is there a decline in their value to the Far East? Should these missions any longer go on? What should be the attitude of Protestant Christianity toward the non-Christian religions of the East?

The answer of the Commission to its first question is very explicit:

> "That these missions should go on, with whatever changes, we regard, therefore, as beyond serious question.
>
> "There is in this fact, however, no ground for a renewed appeal for the support, much less for the enlargement, of these missions in their present form and on their present basis.
>
> "This Commission makes no such appeal.
>
> "In our judgment, there is not alone room for change; there is necessity for change, in respects which our report will indicate; and *the effecting of such change should be the condition* for every further enlargement of the enterprise."

In view of other foes, such as materialism and "the philosophies of Marx, Lenin, Russell," the Eastern religions have some common cause with Christianity, and therefore as a consequence of the changed conditions confronting mission effort, the report points out as one of the outstanding requirements of the future:

> "The necessity that the modern mission make a positive effort, first of all, to know and understand the religions around it, and then to recognize and associate itself with whatever kindred elements there are in them. . . . If a new idea is to take sturdy root

> it should make maximum use of whatever kindred ideas have been there before. . . . It is not what is weak or corrupt but what is strong and sound in the non-Christian religions that offers the best hearing for whatever Christianity may have to say.
>
> "It is clearly not the duty of the Christian missionary to attack the non-Christian systems of religion. It is his primary duty to present his conception of the true way of life and let it speak for itself."

As to "superstition," it must also be eradicated from Christianity.

Here again the churches are called upon to consider how far they shall espouse or oppose social theories, another question on which the boards and missionaries will need long consideration. The proposition, as here stated, relative to the religions of the East, needs to be considered in the light of more comprehensive considerations, which are presented at length.

The Commission calls for a reorientation, in view of theological changes which involve a new motivation, the consideration of a new world-culture and the rise of nationalism in the Near East and the Far East. These can hardly be called new questions, as they have already brought some changes in missionary motive and administration.

Before proceeding to emphasize the consideration with which our study is concerned, we need to extricate it from the other proposals, to avoid misunderstanding in our conclusions. The limitations of the Inquiry need to be made clear. First, as to the method by which the report was presented to the public and which is bound to create misapprehension. That previous consultation with the boards would have avoided misconception, in large measure, there is no doubt. The first and last word in unity is conference. Too much was left, by the publicity releases, to be explained and interpreted. The public would assume much more as to the representative and authoritative character of the Commission than is warranted on the part of so voluntary a group. Indeed, the methods of the Commission, in this and other respects, raise important questions of policy. How far should surveys and inquiries be committed to agencies unrelated officially to the churches, whose possible insulation is in danger of causing loss of realism and perspective? Detachment, objectivity and fact-finding have their hazards. This question becomes all the more important when such detached bodies not only attempt a survey as to facts and a determination of policies, but also proceed to formulate actual programs, in sharply defined and insistent terms, without anterior consultation with those responsible for the carrying out of such programs in actual practice. Still further and with more significance does the question arise when such a group discusses and reaches at least partial conclusions, upon views and convictions which have been regarded as the essential motivation and object of missions. While, upon these persuasions, the Commission is not a unit,[9] some of its members appear to have based their study of a profound adventure upon conceptions which would involve a complete change in what has been a considerable measure of the incentive and purpose of missions.

In this case there is a seeming arbitrariness of tone which intensifies these questions. In its earnestness, the Commission perhaps took itself a bit too seriously, as we all so often do. It does not, at all points, illustrate the intellectual humility for which, at one point, it pleads and is not free from a dogmatism of its own.

The answer, however, is clear. Unless the churches and the boards continue to develop and integrate their own agencies, such as the Foreign Missions Conference and the Federal Council, give them still larger freedom and, through them, make their own surveys, encourage more self-analysis and criticism, and formulate more completely united policies and programs themselves, it will be done by these voluntary and detached groups, whose course will not and should not be repressed by mere officialism. It should be observed, however, that foreign missions have, in many respects, carried coöperation and union, surveys and inquiries, to greater lengths than other church agencies. Indeed, there have been previous appraisals of significance. The Commission expresses the earnest desire "that no measures will be adopted so timid and compromising, so uncertain of meeting obvious needs, *as to necessitate the organization of new channels outside of the established boards.*" It is to be hoped that this will be regarded, not as a threat, but as a needed warning, in order that the hope of the Commission will be fulfilled and that "the churches at home will realize that the situation is far too serious to permit further drifting along in disunion." It is quite likely that the Commission is here considering the alleged scepticism or indifference of the rising generation. This consideration should not be overlooked. Whether all of the underlying principles of the report will command allegiance from the younger generation, there is considerable doubt.

---

[9] "Re-Thinking Missions," Harper & Bros., 1932. Page xiv.

In any event, the report and its proposals must be considered on their own merits and prejudice must not be permitted to becloud the issue. In other words, the boards and churches should consider them just as seriously as if they had been authoritative and official.

As to the report itself, we may note some of its omissions and limitations. It is undoubtedly too indiscriminate in its characterization of the missionaries. More recognition might have been accorded those missionaries who have so largely adapted themselves to the requirements of progress. Moreover, many missionaries who were unlearned or theologically limited, have wrought effectively through unselfish and sacrificial living. While this is recognized, it is obscured by the general criticism in the report. Moreover, the relation of early missions and missionaries to the beginnings of social Christianity will bear some study.

Still further, more consideration needs to be given to the progress of the last quarter of a century in the progressive adoption of the very policies and program which are now recommended as though something newly discovered by the Commission. Indeed, the writer recalls that he was a member of a committee, in 1920, which issued a volume[10] touching prophetically upon some of the problems treated in this report. Had it not been for the constructive work of the past twenty-five years, little would be gained by this appraisal of present and future imperatives. Indeed, the Commission might well have accorded somewhat more commendation than they did to the bodies that made possible the study they have made and without whose existence and progress they could not have made it. Criticism is far easier than laborious construction. It is hoped that a great body of laymen will now perceive more clearly than previously the significance of the movement for federal unity among its organized bodies.

Attention might be called to several other instances where desire for emphasis has led to overstatement. It is more important, however, to consider the positive and constructive elements of the report. Its strong appeal for the continuance of foreign missions was needed and is made all the more effective by its judicial attitude, even though it may be found that perpetuity is not to be based upon all the concrete and exact items of the proposed program.

The section on relations with the religions of the East calls for far more study than this Commission can possibly have given it. It raises profound questions. That missionaries should not "attack" or express hostility to these religions has long been a commonplace.[11] One cannot be sure as to how much may be implied in this section. That secularism, in both East and West, is a grave menace to Christianity and calls for primary consideration, no one can doubt. If, however, the Commission means to urge a process of syncretization, they have opened up a long and wide inquiry. Christianity is a message of spirit and life, not a philosophy to be considered with other philosophical systems. There is a place for Jesus Christ among adherents of many eclectic philosophies. Christianity is a revelation for all mankind. The Christion gospel is an evangel, not a system of doctrine. The Christian experience of God, through Jesus Christ, is far loftier than creed, ritual or polity, which seek to express it. Christianity is thus so unique that its disciples need not fear loss by recognizing any elements that it may have in common with Eastern religions or philosophies. The Christian message is not another philosophy and indeed not another religion in just the sense that that term is applied to the philosophies or codes of living in the East. At least, it is a different type of religion. This message may render its service without reference to any syncretic philosophy, and missionary progress cannot be conditioned upon the solution of this question. The report is somewhat obscure and raises a question to which it does not give adequate answer, although the spirit and attitude by which it should be approached is indicated. Any effort to commingle philosophies of religion may well be left to schools and scholars. There are multitudes to be considered other than the Eastern intellectuals. If the report leads us to a completer revelation of simple Christian faith and life it will accomplish a capacious task. That the Commission believes it will is indicated by these words: "We feel that the Christian view of life has a magnificence and glory of which its interpreters, for the most part, give little hint."

---

[10] "The Missionary Outlook in the Light of the War," by the Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook, 1920.

---

[11] The writer especially recalls "Ways of Sharing with Other Faiths," by Daniel J. Fleming (Association Press, 1929), and other volumes by the same author, which were commended by many mission leaders, especially as to the attitudes to be taken.

The definition of social Christianity as an expression of the gospel appears in accord with that which the author has given in this volume. The duty of the missionaries to coöperate with peoples of the Eastern religions or of no religion, in human service, is so obvious as to eliminate discussion, and it need not await or be dependent upon any syncretic effort of an academic nature. It is not altogether unlike the coöperation between Jews, Roman Catholics and Protestants, in common social and humanitarian interests, in our own land, which generally leads to mutual understanding.

The observation that the missionaries themselves have serious limitations and that stronger personnel is needed; that the native churches should be strengthened and led to larger self-support; that education and evangelization should be redefined in their relationship; that institutions of higher education should take into account the question of their relation to national universities, will doubtless receive general approval from at least the more progressive boards, even though they may differ from the Commission in the resulting conclusions. The leaders of foreign missions began these studies some time ago. The general principle of concentration and of the all-round ministry of medicine, education, social and economic welfare and religious instruction, while not new, should receive renewed attention, through this report. Upon the place of evangelism in relation to philanthropy and social service there will be considerable needed discussion, at least of the judgment that

> "the time has come to set the educational and other philanthropic aspects of mission work free from organized responsibility to the work of conscious and direct evangelization."

One can see opportunity for careful definition at this point. The distinctions between impulse, word and deed are not acute; they tend to syncretize. There is also the possible charge of surreptition to be avoided. That educators should be of the highest educational type,[12] deeply Christian in faith and life, but not charged with the mission of preaching and evangelization, is doubtless what the Commission means. Upon the necessity for the highest medical skill in medical work; the need of statesmanship in agricultural missions; the significance of social and industrial problems; special consideration of the needs and service of women, and on many other recommendations there can probably be little dissent. If mission leaders will read the Jerusalem message of 1928 with care and give due heed, not only to its words but also to its implications, they will perhaps be surprised to find that they have already anticipated, or approached, the Laymen's Inquiry, at many points. And while, at other points, the two messages are in apparent disagreement, it may well be that each will serve as a corrective or enlargement of the other. In any event the Jerusalem message affords access to further study. When compared with the addresses of the Jerusalem Conference, one finds some very striking agreements in the Laymen's Report. The approach to social objectives in the Jerusalem message is fully as satisfying as anything in the report.

This rather long introduction brings us to the main issue. The most significant element of the report is its section on unity, which needs to be considered detached from any theological implications or exactitude in method of unification. It puts into brief compass the thesis of this volume, in the following judgment:

"A profound transformation of the Church in the mission field of the Orient is needed. The main direction indicated is away from sectarianism toward unity and coöperation, and away from a religion focused upon doctrine toward a religion focused upon the vital issues of life for the individual and for the social environment in which the individual lives. Modes of baptism will take a place of lesser importance; forms of ecclesiastical organization will fall into the background; the exact formulation of doctrinal phrases will have less significance."

---

[12] The study of the recent mission deputation of members of the American Society of Church History is of deep interest in this connection.

The more important fact is that many other recommendations and any possibility of their fulfillment or wise modification rest back upon this one. For example, treating the question of mission schools, the Commission says:

"Another part is our disunity. The 30,000 pupils of Christian mission schools in China are divided among scores of denominations, each school managed by its own mission. Further, that mission is not made up of teachers and educational experts: it actually consists of evangelists, doctors, teachers, usually a majority of women—wives of missionaries, and single women. They are supposed to pass judgment as a body, and that body is not qualified to deal with matters of education.

"A large responsibility for the future of Christian education in the East rests upon the mission boards and agencies at home. Only by the most genuine coöperation at home can these problems abroad be met, and the strongest teachers be enabled to serve as Christians would wish to serve."

Dealing with the important question of agricultural missions:

"It would be a calamity if the churches of America were to rush into this situation with the amateurish equipment, the unintelligent divisiveness of effort, and the almost total lack of statesmanly comprehension with which they now confront this great event, the rapid rise of nationalism and the attendant awakening of the masses of Asia.

"Neither church nor mission, however, will be permanently content to serve solely as a general social ambulance corps, especially since this work will gradually be taken over by other agencies.

"All the agricultural missionaries in any given country should operate under one management capable of planning and coördinating their work.

"That the mission boards, recognizing the technical character of agricultural missions and the need for their coördination under scientific planning, join together in establishing an agency to plan and supervise their work in this field. Ultimately this agency should be a section of a unified mission board organization."

Attention is called to stewardship and the fact that "there is no agency of review" to determine "whether or not funds are distributed wisely." In order that this be not misleading, it should be observed that the several boards have their own agencies for these ends. Doubtless the report is, at this point, based upon the facts that there has not been uniformity in administration and that it has not been unified.

In dealing with social and industrial questions: "One form of coöperative effort which seems absolutely essential is the establishment of a new school or schools for social and economic research," and the need is also urged for common literature. The foreign mission boards, through the Committee of Reference and Counsel of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America and the International Missionary Council have now their opportunity. The case has been laid open to a public whose interest in foreign missions, although constantly increasing, has never been adequate to so great a cause. It may be noted, however, that Foreign Missions are not alone in this and it is of interest to add that during the recent depression they have suffered far less than some other agencies. The result of this inquiry may, it is hoped, dispel the shadows by the light of a statesmanship that will be something more than diplomacy, something beyond mere reference and counsel, even beyond coöperation and more than comity, something that, through larger unity, will revitalize foreign missions.

It will also be in the interest of Christian unity to apply the same method of study to American missions in Latin America, where coöperation and unity have made such striking advances, and to American missions in Continental Europe, the latter in their relations with the indigenous Reformed, Lutheran, Eastern Orthodox and other churches.

And again, the time has come when a substantial unity must precede action rather than be the result of it. Not alone mission boards, but the churches themselves, must face the opportunity, for not only the Foreign Missions Conference has responsibility, but likewise the Federal Council. The church bodies, through the Federal Council, should meet the challenge. Indigenous churches will mean indigenous national councils or unions of churches. Not only are foreign missions under deliberation; the scale may turn in such manner as to determine, for at least the next decade, or quarter century, the progress of Christian unity at its very centers. What these laymen urge in this realm of Christian service applies equally to every other department of church life and action.

As in other proposals of the Inquiry, the ideal sought needs to be distinguished from the concrete form in which it is expressed. The proposed plan of administration may be, at present, impracticable and may not even be found the most desirable. The entrusting of large financial power to a limited group has its dangers, as experience in dealing with highly financed foundations sometimes illustrates. A larger plan is indeed a possibility. It overlooks the fact that American foreign missions are associated with British and Continental agencies. They must be sharers in consultation. There are also values in personal relationship between boards and missionaries to be conserved by a more federal form of union, which may attain the end sought, in large measure. It may be better to carry a larger body of churches from stage to stage than a smaller group all the way at once. Any assumption or intimation that the proposed unity in the field need not be coincident with the same order at home, is hardly valid. Criticism and reconstruction, like charity, begin at home. We have an illustration, in this instance, of the essential distinction between a body suited for survey and fact-finding, and one for policies and programs. We may, however, look to the boards to correct all these deficiencies in perspective. In fact, it is not new agencies that are needed. We may be more grateful than the Commission appears to have been, that in the Foreign Missions Conference, the Federal Council, the International Missionary Council, the Universal Council for Life and Work, and the National Councils in the field, we have the agencies of federal unity which made such a survey possible, and which are even better prepared to consider the Commission's proposals than the Laymen's Commission itself; and that, in the Jerusalem message, the churches are already, both directly and by implication, committed, at least in considerable measure, to the task. Any assumption that historic institutions should be uprooted is, in the main, contrary to theories of progress. Possibly a larger recognition or consciousness of the Christian church would have helped the report. Existing agencies and forces should be utilized. At the same time we may also be equally glad that the Laymen's Inquiry has challenged them to action, fulfillment and enlargement of their own ends.

The spirit and purpose of the following conclusions of the Commission are entirely realizable, in substance, by the development of federal unity, through existing organizations:

> "Observation makes it clear that the spirit of unity and co-operation is far more active in the field than at home, and that progress toward union on the field has been retarded by the lack of centralization at the base.

"Decisive action must be taken by these same people if the missionary enterprise is not to deteriorate and eventually to wither into insignificance.

"The Commission proposes, therefore, a single administrative unit for the foreign Christian enterprise in place of the complex, costly and duplicative machinery the existence of which is encumbering the great work that Christian goodwill is trying to do.

"Denominations willing to coöperate should participate in the organization of a council for the administrative direction of missionary effort in all fields. Where separate women's boards still exist, they should be included, with appropriate representation in the Council.

"We trust that the churches at home will realize that the situation is far too serious to permit further drifting along in disunion; and that they will take prompt and vigorous measures to bring about such a realignment of forces as will evoke creative missionary statesmanship at home and abroad, command the enthusiasm of the finest and most adventurous type of Christian young men and young women, and open the way for a more fruitful expression of goodwill, as followers of Jesus, toward the people of other lands."

The substantial volume embodying these proposals closes with the appeal for unity. It refers to "costly overlapping and wasteful overhead expenses." Still more, these laymen deplore the "more vital losses involved in spiritual disunity." The Commission proposes "a body of creative leaders raised above the level of denominationalism" and "a united and coördinated front on the foreign field."

The writer cannot forbear a further word. It may be hoped that these laymen will go on with the main task, that of arousing a deeper interest in the church upon the part of their lay fellows and something of the same attention to its interests that they show in their business life. The strictures upon the unsocial and unchristian methods in Far Eastern trade, industry and commerce constitute an *argumentum ad hominem,* to laymen. As for the mission boards, they will give themselves to a searching inquiry as to how far the Commission is right in its plea for the larger unity it urges. Indeed, it is heartening to learn that even as these pages are being written, several mission boards are responding wisely to the challenge of a report which might have been resented. They ought to avoid reaching or declaring conclusions as separate units until they have fully considered the measures proposed in long and patient conference together. The report has raised questions and problems which it does not adequately answer or solve. For example it does not furnish a satisfactory analysis as to what constitutes Christian Education. It becomes now the duty of the boards to accept and act upon a long agenda which the Commission has presented.

Finally, while the writer would diverge or dissent from some affirmations in the report, often in their emphases, on this issue it is in substantial accord with the underlying principles of federal unity. In the field itself, the organic union, such as the South India plan, of the native churches, can be furthered, as it should be. The Commission wisely admits that "particular consideration may indicate the wisdom of adopting variations in the working out of the principles laid down." This may need to be applied to several sections in the report. But in its insistence on foreign missions as a continuing "obligation," to assume more permanency of form and method; to proclaim a "message of Christianity" which "presents a way of life and thinking which the Christian conceives . . . as a way for all men, entering without violence into the texture of their living and transforming it from within" through "a true and well-qualified evangelism" rather than through a process of doctrinizing; to include a ministry to human needs as in itself evangelistic; all to be done above sectarian and denominational levels, is in accord with the spirit of this volume. In any event this report may indicate that the author has not gone too far in his urgency for the speedy progress of our present and promised federal unity. Whatever may be the differences of judgment upon the other problems dealt with, these need not hinder the immediate and imperative solution of this major concern, upon which all the others are dependent and which will cause light to shine upon them. Unity must precede policy and program. Our preeminent need is to syncretize our own thinking about the Christian gospel in very simple terms. To permit this report to be a divisive factor would be a reproach to the Christian churches. It will not be, if coöperative conference, thought and prayer are given to it, in a Christian spirit. It may be hoped that the consecrated earnestness of the Commission may be contagious and impelling.

That this will be fulfilled is indicated by the actions of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, December 19-22, 1932:

> "The Foreign Missions Conference of North America recognizes gratefully the earnest and unselfish services of the Appraisal Commission of the Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry and their constructive proposals. We are at the same time solicitous with reference to unfavorable reactions throughout the Church to the press releases given out in advance of the appearance of the Report, and also to a number of points in the Report itself.
>
> "We recommend that in the measures adopted by the Boards for fostering the study of the Report special attention be given to clearing up misunderstandings and to removing wrong impressions, and that we seek to take to heart and profit by the timely and forward-looking recommendations of the Report.
>
> "The Conference, in the light of the present most critical world situation, and of the inspiring challenge of the Herrnhut Meeting, as well as of the recognition on the part of the Appraisal Commission of the need of adequate aims and message for the missionary enterprise, wish to reaffirm the Message of the Jerusalem Meeting of the International Missionary Council and the findings of the meetings of the Council at Oxford and Heernhut dealing with the basis and central emphasis of the world mission in which we

are united with the older and younger churches throughout the world.

"The Foreign Missions Conference of North America rejoices in its connection with the notable group of Christian missionaries in all lands who by life and teaching are bringing Christ and His saving power to the knowledge of men who have not known Him. The members of the Conference realize that the raising of standards of preparation and equipment, together with the maintaining of a growing spiritual life, meets the joyous welcome of the present missionary force. We set our faces toward the future with all its calls to advance and new ministries in glad loyalty to those who now bear the burden and heat of the day in the missionary enterprise. We trust the missionaries to be sent out in the coming years will master the new conditions that may arise and that they may render in their day a service as valiant and understanding as has been rendered by those who have gone before them or who will welcome them to their fields of labor."

The action of The Herrnhut Conference referred to was as follows:

"We have considered afresh what is central in our missionary work and where the chief emphasis should be laid. We are convinced that our missionary task is to proclaim in word and life God's revelation and redemption in Jesus Christ.

"If we have anything to bring in the name of God to a world in need, it is certainly not our own piety, our own way of life, our own modes of thought or our own human help. What the Church has to give in its world mission is the good news of a Divine act in history, of the Word made flesh. Apart from this there is no Christian mission. In face of the powerful anti-Christian forces operating in the world today we reaffirm our faith that the revelation of God in Christ is the only way of deliverance for mankind, and that it alone can provide the foundation for an order of society that will be according to the will of God."

The Foreign Missions Conference at Briarcliff Manor voted to call very soon a "general conference" of mission boards in the United States and Canada wishing to send delegates for the consideration of setting up "coöperative activities." No specific definition of "coöperative activities" was given, but it was indicated that these might include suggestions for federation of churches or institutions overseas, new agreements regarding territorial divisions, coöperative approach to the colleges for missionary candidates, coöperation at home in presenting the cause of missions to churches and communities. It was pointed out that the calling of this general conference is a widening of the invitation extended by the Board of Foreign Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church to the six other boards associated in the Laymen's Inquiry, for the appointment of a joint committee to study means of further cooperation. The Foreign Missions Conference proposal invites every mission body in the United States and Canada to similarly plan coöperative efforts.

The Conference also accepted the recommendation of one of its committees for such a revision of the activities of the Conference and of its Committee of Reference and Counsel —the continuing agency—as will enable it virtually to "draft" a few executives of the constituent boards for specific tasks. As the Conference undertakes certain united efforts—such as a united program of home cultivation, approach to the colleges for candidates, or a study of the rural or medical situation—it will be empowered to ask a board for the temporary release of an executive, particularly qualified for this task, for a given period of time. In other words, the Conference will engage in certain promotional projects but will not engage a staff for this purpose; the staff will be loaned for the common task by the constituent bodies.

It was announced that plans are already under way in the Home Base Committee of the Conference for a united program of church and community cultivation beginning in the spring of 1933. The personnel and leadership of this program will be drawn from a number of boards.

Note: That we are too close to this appraisal to appraise it judicially is evident. This section of this volume was submitted to two Christian leaders of differing viewpoints. One urged the elimination of certain of the author's observations. The other recommended the deletion of a different set of comments. A third reader ventured the judgment that the writer had attempted "to carry water on both shoulders," which may mean that an effort has been made to treat the report with sympathetic discrimination, allowing time and thought for conclusions. It may be that when the fact-finding studies, upon which the report was largely based, are available for study, judgments may be better formed. Indeed these alone make the inquiry well worth while.

THE WORLD MOVEMENTS

The same path of advance applies to the more comprehensive world movements, both organizationally and in institutional content. The Universal Christian Council for Life and Work and the International Missionary Council will ultimately be united in some form. Such bodies as the Lambeth Conference and the several ecumenical denominational bodies should become agencies for Christian unity rather than for the intensifying of denominational consciousness. The World's Sunday School Association, the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches and similar institutions should lend their forces to the Universal Council to avoid diverting influence and strength. The World Conference on Faith and Order has already tacitly agreed that federal unity has the immediate future. Might not its adherents follow the implications and continue accordingly, as a study group for the Universal Council?

But what of the confessions and the theories of church and ministry and sacrament? The Lausanne Conference of 1927 and later conferences make it clear that liberty must be granted or at least will be exercised, in such theories. Indeed, to a very great extent, within many of the communions, including Anglican and Episcopal and excepting perhaps only the Eastern churches, there is such liberty today to individual churches and pastors. And yet there is no reason why tradition should remain undefined. Let Lausanne continue its studies and conferences, not permitting meanwhile our theories to obstruct our unity on deeper realities. Possibly the Lausanne Committee might unite with the Committee of Theologians of the Universal Christian Council for Life and Work. Indeed, the prophetic layman who was the great leader of the World Conference on Faith and Order until his lamented death, Robert H. Gardiner, ten years ago suggested closer association between the two bodies. The Lausanne of the future, whatever its form, should not continue detached and unrelated to Christian unity in practice.

Meanwhile, we may well seek to hasten the movements for the completer union of family and homogeneous groups.[18] Here is a partial but significant relief for overchurched or underdistributed local fields as well as a lessening of the complexity of national units. Indeed, the union of the Baptist and Free Baptist bodies was largely taken in hand by their local churches uniting. The recent union of the several Methodist bodies in England is a sign of the times. In the field of Foreign Missions the way is open for organic union, especially in the development of new fields.

Finally, the movements for Christian unity are freighted with promise. It is irresistible. But it has been, is and will be a process of growth. Of course there will always be some sects and parties maintaining complete self-identity and aloofness. But they will lose significance and will cease to be a cause of reproach to Christianity, as they become relatively obscured by the larger united church, especially if, as may be hoped, one name and title may be used to designate its constituent churches, denominational and local, throughout the nation and the world. The time is perhaps not far distant when the Universal Christian Council for Life and Work, the International Missionary Council and the World Conference on Faith and Order will meet together, to these ends.

---

[18] See "Handbook of the Churches." Federal Council, 1931.—"Current Movements towards Church Union," by Samuel McCrea Cavert.

It might seem as though these pages had been given disproportionately to organization. A careful reconsideration, however, will reveal the fact that they have really appealed for less and simpler organization just to relieve us from our present multiplicity of machinery. Moreover, it will be seen that organization and content are mutually dependent, the one constantly affecting the other, although it is obvious that the institutional soul is of more significance than its embodiment. It is the contention of this volume that in spirit the Christian churches are already in vital, living unity which their present outward forms fail to express. As they seek the one they also find the other. In this world there can be no disembodied spirits. A group of executively minded men and women would have relatively little difficulty in effecting a simple but inclusive form of organization, federally conceived.

Thus we may find our way toward a body which may make its impact upon the world. In its several "members," to use the language of Paul, there will be intellectual freedom in thinking and in forms of expression. With this liberty and autonomy, the several members, while acting and reacting upon each other, will be united in the worship of God, with their one message of Christ to the world, rendering in their several spheres, service to mankind, giving world-wide expression to their desire

> "to manifest the essential oneness of the Christian Churches in Jesus Christ as their divine Lord and Saviour,
>
> "to express the fellowship and catholic unity of the Christian church,
>
> "to bring the Christian bodies into united service for Christ and the world,

> "to encourage devotional fellowship and mutual counsel concerning the spiritual life and religious activities of the churches,
>
> "to secure a larger combined influence for the churches of Christ in all matters affecting the moral and social condition of the people, so as to promote the application of the law of Christ in every relation of human life."[14]

And surely there may be a common name "The Church of Christ," whatever may be its sub-titles to indicate any special forms and adaptations.

---

[14] From the Preamble of the Federal Council.

CHAPTER XII

THE FUNCTIONS OF FEDERAL UNITY

Let us now seek to further define the functions of these united churches. They may be summarized as follows: the proclamation of a Christian message to the world; the preparation of the messengers; the education and evangelization of the disciples in their spiritual experience; the cultivation of their devotional life expressed in worship and the sacraments; their service to humanity; the faithfulness of their stewardship.

The Christian Message

If the Christian churches of the world all have one and the same message to the world, one might ask—why seek further for any bond of unity? As has been already affirmed, the Christian unity of the church's evangel is revealed in the three great messages of Lausanne, Jerusalem and Stockholm. They are mutually supplementary and in substance identical. This Christian message is not a statement of philosophy in the form of doctrines. These three proclamations express the common Christian consciousness of men and women of widely differing philosophies and those of no philosophy at all.

The Christian gospel, as given by Jesus, was very simple. It was an evangel. It is not "a set of correct views; it is not a system of philosophy, it is a way of life, a discipline, an utter self-committal . . . in the realm of the spirit."[1]

We must, therefore, not look to some new Tertullian or

---

[1] "The New Dimensions of Religion," by Allyn K. Foster. Macmillan, 1931.

Athanasius to bring us relief, except that we may be able to distinguish faith from efforts to express it in philosophy. Karl Barth, for example, is a great preacher. He has a real evangel and has brought out into our disordered world great affirmations of truth. But they are obscured by his underlying philosophy. In his effort to escape humanism he leads us into a transcendentalism which is inescapably dualistic. In the attempt to avoid religious subjectivity he becomes dogmatically subjective. He runs from the arms of a Schleiermacher to those of a Schopenhauer. He utters a great truth and then by his unsupported "therefore," reduces it to an empty abstraction by his antithesis. His system is thus disordered because without perspective. While this and much more may be said of the "dialectical theology," its originator has revealed the limitations and eternal needs of mankind in a startling way.

But, while we may deeply sympathize with Barth's protest against humanistic vacuities and with his solicitude to recover a sense of God as sovereign and infinite in His universe; we can see that in his desire to magnify the First Person of the Trinity and His revelation through the Second, he has not sufficiently recognized the gift of the Holy Spirit[2] and thus has lost much of the meaning of the Incarnation. While empirical processes do not always bring certitude, and pragmatism is not the only, or always sure, test of validity, we may distinguish between the sense of our essential kinship with the Infinite and the apotheosizing of humanity—a distinction which Barth fails to make in his doctrine of the divine "otherness."

Finally, however, this dynamic personality has set men to rethinking and rediscovery; he has interpreted and analyzed the restlessness of human hearts and he has restored fundamental but forgotten or neglected truths which, when released from his own confusing antitheses and extracted from his dialectics and his resulting "system," will make his disciples hopeful rather than despairing, as they often are now. We await with deep interest the maturer reflections and experiences, especially of the younger generation of those now dazzled by this brilliant personality. Meanwhile we are fortunately not compelled to make an exclusive choice between the subjectivity of a Canon Raven and the objectivity of Barth for our faith in the reality of God.

---

[2] To be sure, Barth in his volume *Zur Lehre vom Heiligen Geist* and elsewhere, has set forth a doctrine of the Holy Spirit, which, however, is at least obscured by his conception of the "otherness" of God.

While the disciples of this great evangelist assert that the church has surrendered to the world, and they seek to escape from it, in this "theology of Crisis," Dr. Keller,[8] in his masterly analysis, recognizes these contradictions, and he probably overestimates the influence of this movement in its effect on the church, on social Christianity and on Christian unity. His advice that due attention be paid to the problems raised is timely. But we have seen too many such apparitions to be overanxious about this or any other new theology, thanks to the sovereign and abiding influence of Christian experience in the souls and lives of simple Christians, who like the blind man when restored by Jesus, knew one thing, namely, that "whereas I was blind, now I see."

In fact, Dr. Keller himself, while recognizing the values of this new emphasis, offers us a far better solution for our theological problems. He presents a luminous conception of the motives and meanings of Christian unity, or, to use his term, the Ecumenical movement. Its theology must be dynamic and not static. It must thus be progressive. It must be sympathetic, but not a minimum belief nor an artificial synthesis. Men must, above all, be able to translate each other's conceptions, with understanding. The Ecumenical movement should

[8] *Der Weg der dialectischen Theologie durch die kirchliche Welt,* by Adolf Keller.

follow the Barthian in ever looking Godward. On the other hand, he would persuade the followers of Barth to become, not a hostile, but a contributing force to Ecumenical Christianity.

Dr. Keller's irenic discussion is thus perhaps the most enlightening that has come to us, viewing the theological problems of the Ecumenical movement. But we must not let even so persuasive a thinker as Professor Keller lead us too far into theological abstractions and, above all, we should not permit any philosophic system, much less one that is "dialectical," to find its way into the path of Christian unity. Dr. Keller makes it clear that he has no such purpose and although he feels the need of a theological background, he would not identify ecumenism with any system. He urges both the followers of Barth and the proponents of Christian unity to seek together the knowledge of the "will of God," not only in a theological, but also in a very empirical and practical meaning.

It is the strong feeling of the writer that Karl Barth, not as a systematic theologian, but as a great preacher and evangelizer, would bring great power into the organized existence of ecumenical Christianity.

A volume just at hand[4] amply illustrates the diversity of scholastic thought among genuinely Christian men, but at the same time reveals the rich contributions to our thinking from their varying emphases. It is especially to be noted that these diversities are not denominational, but rather those of schools of philosophy. For the most part they all take a position which avoids the extremes of Humanism and Barthianism or Fundamentalism. The significant matter is that they reveal a common spiritual and Christian experience and are at one when most subjective. A common Christianity survives their mental processes and abstractions. They appear to be seeking a more fervid evangelicalism. Revelation is sought in Jesus and in the history of Christianity itself, as a spirit and way of life in God through Christ.

---

[4] "Contemporary American Theology," edited by Vergilius Ferm. Round Table Press, 1932.

Still another book, somewhat composite in nature, presents the same course of thought.[5]

We find the same tendency in the social outlook of the Federal Council, as witnessed in the introduction to the social ideals of 1908, reaffirmed in 1932:

> "The Churches of Christ as represented in this Federal Council accept without reserve and assert without apology the supreme authority of Jesus Christ.
>
> "We are one in Him not only because we together share His spirit, but because we acknowledge His headship. Wherever the path in which He leads crosses other highways, whether marked out by the creeds of commerce, the schools of philosophy, the teachers of social theory, the masters of theology, the agitators for reform, the critics of the Church or the feet of the multitude, His disciples must take all risks and follow Him. Our interpretations of His teaching and purpose are, doubtless, with growing light and new conditions, subject to review and restatement, but no such modification can force or allure the Church to surrender the principle of His absolute authority in the individual heart and in the associated life of men."

The message of 1932 adds that: "the tasks are beyond us and their accomplishment will be indefinitely delayed or frustrated, unless there can be a nation-wide spiritual awakening which has social goals. Our supreme need is a spiritual awakening." Some such touches as these might well be added to the Laymen's Foreign Mission Inquiry, to which previous reference has been made.

These several instances illustrate the impracticability of seeking unity by any syncretic method in philosophy or system of doctrine.

---

[5] "A Preface to Christian Faith in a New Age," by Rufus M. Jones. Macmillan, 1932.

While, thus, the Christian message must escape all these subtleties, are there no great affirmations which are abiding and eternal? There are, and they are equally profound and simple. They are both individual and social in their application. They are free from the confusion of both the ancient and modern systems of doctrine.

The sovereign concern of humanity is the relation of the human soul to God. The quest for the Infinite is the chief end of man. The longing for the Eternal is the finest aspiration and the most universal yearning of his soul. As the hart panteth for the water-brooks, so thirsts the human heart to know the living God, in whom we live and move and have our being. The ultimate article of the ancient confessions was, "I believe in God." That belief was no vague and shadowy thing. He was a sovereign God. This is the supreme article of any faith. Every other is but an inference from it and a corollary to it. It determines the length and height and breadth of man's moral being. Mankind must have the consciousness of Almighty God, Maker of all things, Judge of all men, before whom men are to acknowledge and bewail their manifold transgressions against his divine majesty, by which they justly provoke the infinite wrath and indignation, to whom they repent and pray, "Have mercy upon us."

The Scriptures speak with profound consistency upon the foundations of religion. Everywhere, on every page, from Genesis to Joshua, from Judges to Job, from Psalm to Prophet, from Matthew to Revelation, in every one of Professor Cheyne's Isaiahs, in every Hexateuchal document, from beginning to end, one truth stands unshaken as the firmament itself; God is God. To do his holy will means ultimate blessing; to defy it means disaster and death. Men need, above all, in the inviolable solitude of personality, to stand face to face with the divine reality. This sense of the absolute, eternal sovereignty of the Infinite, and nothing less than this, is the ultimate and fundamental of a real religious faith. A godless cosmos becomes a lawless chaos. God is a God of law and order. An ungodly age has become impertinent and hilariously antinomian, with its specious, haggard gainsayings insolently boasted and flaunted in every realm of human life.

Is this to deny the fatherhood of God? Will not a true father rule his household with wisdom, uphold it with his strong arm and guide it with his love?

Let this consciousness of faith be granted and comprehended and the related truths follow as certainly as source and issue. The inevitable conclusions and corollaries are momentous and of deep concern. God is a moral God. Men are moral beings. The first of these deductions is the sense of moral obligation. In the light of a God perfect in character, absolute in righteousness, man beholds himself in contrast. He sees and knows himself only as he knows and feels God, and thus the consciousness of God inevitably brings the sense of human sin. The humanity of our age is forgetting that mankind is sinful. The eternal difference between right and wrong is evaded and ignored. We can afford to dispense with original and theoretical sin. There is enough left that is actual and undeniable. We admit that there are crimes. All else we are prone to look upon as infirmities. There is something between the two. It is sin. We do wrongs; we do them intentionally and volitionally. We repeat them. We sin. We are sinful. The sense of it is the first step to holiness. The better men become, the keener is their consciousness of it. No saint ever lived who did not feel it deeply. The complacent self-satisfaction of our generation needs humbling in the dust. The conception of sin as an offence against an outraged and righteously indignant God is an all too unknown, unheard and forgotten thing. We must relearn the preaching of it. This conception and consciousness of God, with man's self-consciousness, gives him his relation to the universe:

God—I. I live under that all-seeing eye. This Infinite demands righteousness of me. He sees my evil deeds and knows my evil thoughts, and abhors them. He rightly demands confession of them and the substitution of repentance, issuing in good works.

But again, does this impair the heavenly Fatherhood? Will a true father encourage his children in their sin by countenancing it? Is God a mere seller of indulgences? The Fatherhood of God calls for the forbidding of sin, and if he ignores it he is no true Father.

If thus we follow these conceptions of God and the consciousness of sin in the light of moral obligation, we are led on by the undeviating march of law and logic to another ancient affirmation. Cause has relation to effect; acts have their consequences. Men ask indifferently and doubtfully: Is there a judgment? It is the question of a feeble mind. Do moral paths lead nowhere? Can men break laws without consequences? There is yonder lofty column. There is a law called gravitation. Break it, and step impudently from the summit. To break that law means death. Has the Infinite been thus exact in the physical realm of law and indifferent in the spiritual? Is the material universe a cosmos and the spiritual a chaos? The age to which we are called to proclaim the truth needs to be told that while it blinds itself to the eternal future, the eternal laws of God move to their issues with as certain and as ceaseless and eternal march as if men saw them. They may hide their heads beneath the screen of the coverlet, but the lightning does not thereby cease to flash nor lose its pathway to its mark. They may bury their eyes in the desert sands, but they do not thus annihilate the danger. The simple and obvious truth needs to be dwelt on that there are two ways and trends of life—to ruin and to blessedness; that every moral decision of every moral being, that every moral act of every moral personality, brings it nearer the edge or center of a path. Then we must ask men how, in the light of human weakness, in the light of human temptation, we can live without ceaseless prayer and supplication to the infinite strength and grace? We are false to ourselves, and commit a crime against men, if we do not tell them they and we are moving, either toward the heaven of a growing life or toward a day of remorse, by whatever name we call it.

Will there be a judgment? It is—now. Science dares to state it for us in appalling terms. It is called the survival of the fittest—correspondence to spiritual environment. Philosophy calls it cause and effect. Judgment is but another way of stating the law of the survival of the morally fit, of correspondence to divine environment, and the evangelist who warns men to seek the glory or to flee the consequences to come is but stating a proposition in mathematics, that two lines going in different directions will never come together. The divine judgment is the simplest and most apparent of all truths.

Are love and fatherhood again impaired? This moral law of the survival of the fittest has for its end to produce moral fitness. Moral character could be produced no other way. The freedom of the human will involves the principle of moral judgment. And as moral adaptation could be attained by no other method, so moral fitness never will be produced by any other preaching than the solemn preaching of this truth. Would he be a Father if he let his children sin against themselves? Would he be a Father if he let them misuse his other children without correction? The true father wants his children to be good. To gain this end he must, if he be true, use every means. God is so good and loving as to be concerned that his children should have more than enough to eat and drink. He is supremely concerned for their moral welfare. He wants them to be righteous, and He has placed the barrier of retribution between them and evil that they might turn from evil. Judgment, retribution, yea punishment, belong among the evidences of love.

The ultimate end is the regeneration and restoration of sinful men and women. There is no preaching that will accomplish it other than that of these fundamental truths. The awakening in the souls of men of the consciousness of an absolute, holy God, under whose all-seeing eye they live, whose laws they cannot defy without disaster, who hates their sins, who loves them so deeply that he wants to give them the gift of his own infinite righteousness, and has put every obstacle he can, without intruding upon the inviolable solitude of their free personality, between them and sin; this, with the consequent consciousness of sin, is the only way by which that sense of need of redemption is awakened, by which alone redemption can be gained. They all stand or fall together.

But what about our social gospel? The answer is that this is just where it so often becomes weak and impotent. It is at this point, it is true, that the new Barthian theology originally fell short, as did that of our fathers, and it is of interest to observe that a recently revised Barthianism appears to restore the lost perspective. The evangelist must not lose sight of the man in his search for his soul. But we must also not lose sight of the human soul in our vague interest in a wholesale humanity. The age and generation among men and nations call for a solemn, searching, fearless utterance of solemn, searching truths. The older terminology need not be used. We have a vocabulary better suited to our age. We have a light that makes those truths clearer. Science and philosophy are by our side. They give us analogies that are startling, and lend us pregnant and significant terms. But the gospel is outgrown, the Christian pulpit is superfluous, the church of Christ goes out of existence when the truths of the Gospel, the vocabulary of the pulpit, and the constitution of the church do not contain the words *God, sin, judgment and redemption* in all their meaning, majesty and power.

But perhaps we ask, does this not overlook the revelation of Jesus, of a God who is supremely love? The answer is that no Old Testament prophet ever equalled Jesus in his affirmation of Divine Sovereignty and it was the very foundation of his faith. None was so searching as Jesus in the conviction of the sense of sin. And the severest words of the scripture are his solemn words of moral judgment. And with Jesus nothing but a sovereign love could consume human sin, so deeply did he see it.

In the little town of Bedford, England, beneath the statue of John Bunyan, carved in enduring granite, are these descriptive words: "His eyes were lifted up to Heaven. The best of Books is in his hand. The law of truth is written on his lips. The world is behind his back. He stands as if he pleaded with men." We are in danger of losing the art of pleading with men—to think of God, to search their own inmost hearts, to judge themselves; because, in the confused thinking of our day, we have failed to keep our eyes uplift, the best of Books has lost compulsion in that we have missed its grandeur in our critical investigation, our truth has been hesitantly uttered and we thus enfeeble our pleading and lose our power because of no commensurate sense of certainty.

Two things the Christian church and the pulpit of our day and generation need. The one is human love and sympathy. The other is the sense of spiritual authority, as we seek to find again the buried talent of pleading with men. If we assume a spiritual authority without a burning fire of human compassion we become what our master called "a whited sepulchre filled with dead men's bones." And yet, be that human sympathy ever so profound with passion and there be no sense of spiritual certitude, we can do little more for our humanity than lift a limp signal of distress with a weak and pallid hand.

We need then, in a lawless generation, to revive the prophetic spirit and to be first of all Isaiahs, Jeremiahs, Hoseas, to prepare the way for Jesus Christ. We must become John the Baptists forerunning the Redeemer, preaching in a wilderness of religious and moral indifference, and saying, "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," that men may come and be baptized, confessing their sins. We must be more than John the Baptists. But we cannot be more than John the Baptists until we have been John the Baptists. Then, on the morrow, looking upon the transcendent form of the Son of God, revealing so ineffably the Father's character and will and love, we shall, with the joy of the Gospel making our voices to tremble in the transformation of the message, point suppliant and confessing sinners to the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world.

Perhaps the writer may seem inconsistent in thus introducing this much theology into the message. He has done so no farther than Jesus did, for Jesus went no farther than to affirm these simple verities, which are abundantly verifiable by the human conscience and experience. There is little or no difficulty in determining the message of Christian unity. Indeed, are not its great affirmations all the stronger when they stand out in their majesty and their simplicity and are not lost in the mazes of a theological system? When we get too close to smaller things they hide the larger from our vision and we lose sight of the landscape in our inspection of the trees. Our message must have a certitude free from speculative theories about it, that it may be proclaimed with one voice.

The final word is redemption through Christ. His person and teaching reveal to men, God as the Father. He is the mediator of their at-one-ment. Through Christ He is revealed the friend of sinful men, the forgiver of their sins, the bearer of their infirmities, their comforter in sorrow and suffering. He inspires them to sacrifice and leads them into the paths of service. He is the pledge of their eternal life. The last word of all is "God is love." The message is clear. "It is of the essence of Christianity that its central teachings are simple," "the qualifications for grasping it are primarily moral and were first achieved by untutored fishermen; whereas its difficulties" are chiefly found by those who, "befogged by seeming wisdom," "find it hard to return to the direct intuitions of childhood." [6]

Upon this message, as the gatherings of Stockholm, Jerusalem and Lausanne have witnessed, we have an unbroken unity in faith. It is a message that does not need laborious explanation by abstract dialectics. The plain, simple man can understand it, because it is verified in his own deeper life. It is thus a message of faith.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGERS

The time is long past when the messengers of the Gospel itself can be adequately equipped with but the knowledge of a denominational message. The specialized fields in which all the churches are working are no longer denominational, but are more largely and spiritually social. A primary need of all the churches today is that of coöperative and unified thinking in these fields of specialized action, or as the Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry put it, "a body of creative leaders raised above the level of denominationalism."

The members of our churches have long ceased to be "messengers" [7] at all. The older message has lost its impulse. They have not yet been made aware of the newer, larger evangel. Let them once become possessed of a single and sovereign ideal of Christian discipleship and Christian men and women will once again be evangelists. The consciousness of their unity will be contagious.

---

[6] "Re-Thinking Missions." Harper & Brothers, 1932.

[7] II Corinthians viii:23.

The recent Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry has been criticized for its alleged depreciation of evangelism. Any such disparagement was clearly not intended. In any event, the chief need of our day, whether at home or abroad, is an evangel that is so clear and simple, so free from discord, that men and women may again become deeply quickened "messengers of the churches."[8] What is called for, above all else, is a new loyalty and consecration. Christian unity alone today can endow such a sense of fidelity and devotion, to stir the hearts of men to a "Great Awakening."

A united Christian church calls for new leadership.[9] The chief difficulty in the development of federal unity has been that of reorientating denominational leaders. The administration of local councils of churches has been seriously hampered by the lack of men temperamentally constituted and experientially trained for such leadership. The personnel available has often been characterized either by limitation of vision, on the one hand, or by rashness in practice, on the other. The Interchurch World Movement revealed the danger of the latter tendency, while the Federal Council, the Foreign Missions Conference and the Home Missions Council have at times been witness to the limitations of denominationally conscious direction.

This national leadership has been too much centered geographically at denominational headquarters, mainly New York. Even the nation's metropolis is provincial and it would be well if the national bodies, in their constructive tasks and administrative policies were less segregated. The leadership of state, regional and local federation should also become an important element in the national guidance. Doubtless the further development of state councils will tend to these ends.

---

[8] II Corinthians viii:23.

[9] "Securing Christian Leaders for Tomorrow," by Samuel M. Cavert. Doubleday, Doran Co., 1926.

There is a somewhat general feeling that the Federal Council has been disposed to superimpose terms and modes of action, which tends to arouse revolt against its primacy.

The national bodies and to a considerable extent those in local areas have been too clerical, with the exception of the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations. Laymen and women have not as yet reached their proper proportions. One of the most notable changes in the Federal Council has been the recent increase of women in its leadership, but as previously observed, there is room here for much larger improvement.

Thus there needs to be sustained coöperative thinking by the responsible groups. A quadrennial or biennial meeting of the Federal Council and the occasional conferences of the bodies representing the boards of the churches are far from sufficient. Speaking in world terms, the annual gatherings of restricted groups from year to year are not adequate for the great problems involved in our search for unity. It must be taken less casually and far more seriously.

But what about the rising or coming generation? The youth of the nation and of the world have been overlooked. Here, especially, is an opportunity for more careful study to secure commensurate leadership. Above all, perhaps, is the importance of pastoral training. Ordaining councils might well include, in their examinations, the fitness of our coming generation of ministers, for the preaching and practice of these larger ideals, and as to the thinking out of the problems involved, to whom should we look more naturally than to our theological seminaries? The writer has recently pursued an inquiry as to how far the seminaries are sources of our thinking on the problem of unity. He has held discussions with groups of students.

The strictly denominational schools have classes in denominational history and polity and most, if not all, of the denominationally detached institutions have classes in the polities of the several denominational bodies. In not one seminary, however, is there any adequate course in the study of Christian unity such as this volume has attempted and such as some seminaries in Europe have for several years pursued. Not long ago the faculty of a leading seminary prepared a list of one hundred volumes with which their students might start their libraries. The only volume included which treated the subject of Christian unity was a record of the Young Men's Christian Association.

For the most part there is an irenic attitude of mind and an ecumenical spirit. To some extent, generally in different courses, coöperative Christianity in practice is included. A beginning has been made in those seminaries where a lecturer from the Federal Council[10] has given courses in community problems of a practical nature. Perhaps there is also some need, in seminary training, for less diffusion and a more profound spirit of inquiry, in the approach to our social order. Thus far, however, the theological seminaries have not sent out many of the kind of leaders needed who have thought their way through, and one is reminded of Theodore Munger of New Haven who frequently averred that the churches were always ahead of the seminaries.

If there were in every leading seminary but one small group giving intensive study to the problems raised in this volume, it would go a long way toward giving us stronger leadership. Alongside of or partly superseding hermeneutics, polemics and homiletics, we need a genuine study in irenics[10a] to supplement such studies as social service, missions and religious education, and to give point to the study of church history. Thus far, the seminaries have not done their part in furnishing the kind of thinking and practicing leadership which the movement for unity needs. A re-study of the birth of foreign missions, recalling the consecrated intelligence of students of that day and generation, would give inspiration to this end.

---

[10] Rev. Charles R. Zahniser, an excellent exponent of this phase of unity.

[10a] Perhaps Professor Petersmann's designation, "Christian Ecumenics" is preferable. "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1933.

Many examples might be given of individual pastors who have been the means of transforming communities, through their leadership in unifying their Christian forces. But we need many more of them. The seminary faculties should also make a study of the personnel of their students with a view to supplying men for the executive leadership called for.[11]

But we need more than leaders. The uniting of a body of ecclesiastical officials and masters of theology is not Christian unity. Conferences on Christian unity forget the multitude wishing to be led and inspired. The men and women of our churches, living in their social neighborly relations, may become messengers of the spirit to one another. They must be made aware of their one message and experience in the Christian life. There needs to be a well-thought-out program of education and evangelization.

Education and Evangelization

The late Alfred R. Kimball, treasurer of the Federal Council from even before its completion until his death, when asked by prospective contributors to tell what the Council was, used often to reply, "a new state of mind in process of creation." Christian unity is largely a state of mind, and any one familiar with denominational practice will add—a *new* state of mind. It is a mental state that has not as yet grown notably among the constituency of the churches beyond a few leading spirits. Or perhaps it would be truer to say that while by far the larger proportion of church members have become more or less free from sectarian or denominational bias or prejudice and many free from an over-denominational consciousness, they have not gained the new state of mind which makes them sensibly conscious of their spiritual unity. The writer, some time ago, pursued a somewhat secret inquiry among a cross section of church members, to determine the extent to which their pastors informed them as to the meaning, progress and practice of Christian unity. The result was a bit depressing. It was not at all that these ministers were hidebound sectarians. They had, on the whole, a pretty good state of mind themselves, but they did not realize the right and need of their hearers to think and pray on the subject of unity.

---

[11] Union Theological Seminary, which has given more than usual attention to this subject, supplied adaptable men for the staff of the General Wartime Commission of the Churches, including Rev. Samuel McCrea Cavert. Such leaders need a background of knowledge as well as executive ability. Dr. Cavert is now carrying the responsibility of the Federal Council's general administration with eminent wisdom and practical facility.

Most of the literature distributed for the education and evangelization of these disciples is cast in denominational terminology, whereas, as a matter of fact, it more often than not contains a message identical with that of practically all the other denominations. In other words, the people in our churches have not yet been trained to think in large Christian terms. A notable exception to this is the Federal Council's "Fellowship of Prayer." Unity, in the form of coöperation, has gone far beyond the knowledge of it on the part of the church constituency. This probably means that many men and women have left our churches because of impatience that these churches have not kept pace with the demand for unity and that others within the church have failed to come into the new state of mind.

But beyond this is the education of a multitude of church officials, national, regional and local, to divest ourselves of officialism, to waive vested rights, to repel the dead hand of habit and the tendency to continue a "past good" into present conditions in which it ceases to be good.

The movement for Christian unity needs educators and evangelists, in our colleges, denominational and otherwise, and in our pastors' studies, church vestries, consistories and conferences. It is time that it occupied a major place in the agendas of denominational assemblies instead of that of a passing report. There has not yet been any adequate process of education or any burning evangelization in behalf of Christian unity, excepting by and among an eclectic few. A study of the chapter on areas of unity in this volume will reveal the fact that while in large measure federal unity has been broadly educational, it has not yet become an extension course among the people of the churches.

Worship and Sacraments or "Faith and Order"

The business of the church is to make men and women deeply religious in personal life and in social motive. The movement for Christian unity cannot long live any real life by subsisting entirely on an effort to perform a common social task. If Christians who work together as Christians cannot also worship together in spirit, the world will have only a rather faint faith in the church.

This does not mean that they need to have the same theories of worship and sacrament or use identical forms. Christian unity is not likely to go very far in any effort to change the temperaments of men. Unity cannot come by any process except that of accretion. The way must be left open for man's every approach to God and the supernatural. We must make place for the ethical, mystical, sacramental and all other types of human thinking and feeling.

The Gospel is full and rich only when each and every group to be united brings its own special contribution, never by eclecticism. Paul's analysis of "spiritual gifts" in the twelfth chapter of First Corinthians is an article in our charter of membership in the united church.

Indeed, perhaps this is the point at which to utter a word of depreciation for the offhand manner in which occasional apostles of unity decry and condemn anything and everything relating to a Christian denomination as such. They not only lose sight of the missions which these bodies have performed in the course of history, but of the value of their loyalties today. It is only when the larger loyalty is obscured by the lesser that harm is done. In fact, as the writer thinks of the men who have rendered the most useful service to the Federal Council, they have generally been those who were denominationally faithful and loyal. In any event, the denominations are not to be annihilated by fiat.

Differentiation between groups of Christians is not an evil in itself; it is only such when it incites divisiveness or retards the progress of unity. The assumption that history could be undone or reversed by the extemporaneous extinction of all the differing "members" of the one body is quite the opposite of Paul's contention in his classic analysis.

Today these denominations are centralizing within themselves, but let us note that it is a specialization in service rather than on divisive doctrines and forms, so that this very process of denominational unification may simply mean that they bring strength to the "one body."

Thus, unity is coming, not only by elimination, but by accumulation. The attempt to effect an impromptu renunciation of those historic personalities and historical occasions or social impulses, or cherished forms, which have given rise to these several "members," would by no means induce the larger loyalty we seek, but would more likely lead to just the indifference which already so sadly characterizes church members today. We must first construct the larger house and it must contain many mansions, whether the latter be historically, socially or temperamentally constituted. On the other hand, again, this is no excuse for any effort to prolong a situation formerly good, under present conditions in which it ceases to be a good.

In this connection the community church may well be reckoned with. Up to the present these churches have had either divided loyalties or, in the case of those unattached, have had allegiance only to the community. Will this become as strong as the former denominational fealty? It depends on whether or not national and international unity, with a clear definition of its Christian standards and larger historical significance, becomes simply an enlargement of the community spirit. It would seem as though our rapidly increasing and enlarging community consciousness, local, national and international, would create a new loyalty to this enlarging spirit of humanity if that spirit is coincident with an allegiance to Jesus Christ commensurate with it. In any event, the community church has revealed the fact, so often referred to in this volume, that in the increasing homogeneity of our community life the common people are rapidly losing the sense of their sectarian differences and gaining a new sense of their Christian brotherhood and spiritual oneness, thus creating a new sense of loyalty. The community churches are, at least as a rule, just as strongly integrated and have just as great a sense of their oneness as those which bear a denominational name, sometimes even a greater sense.

But, to go beyond this, there will always be differentiated groupings, especially among nations and racial types, as for example between Eastern and Western Christianity. There is but one identity among Christians. It is that of inner experience. As the Bishop of Gloucester tells us:[12]

> "It is sometimes said that there are two types of religion: there is the religion of experience and there is Sacramental religion, which is not the religion of experience. That I believe to be an entirely incorrect distinction. There is just as much religious experience in the Sacramental life as there is for those who are without it. In fact, there are far more Christians to whom religious

---

[12] "The Doctrine of Grace." Macmillan, 1931.

experience comes almost entirely through the Sacraments and who cannot conceive of it in any other form. It is, in fact, a very dangerous thing to build up any testimony on experience, because experience is very largely the creation of antecedent beliefs. A person brought up on the basis of a belief in Conversion and all that it implies obtains spiritual experience in that way. A person brought up to a belief in Confirmation and the Holy Communion obtains religious experience in this way. It does not follow that the experience of either the one or the other is not true because they are different. Religious experience is real because we live in a spiritual environment and our real religious life comes through harmony with that environment; but we inevitably express that experience in the way in which our intellectual development has made possible.

"I believe, then, with regard to Sacraments, that:

"1. The Sacraments were made for use and not for definition.

"2. They represent the work of the Holy Spirit within the Church and those who have already yielded themselves to Christ have in them a new sanctifying life.

"3. There is always the danger of a system like that becoming mechanical if it is divorced from living faith, but the Christian life without its Sacramental element becomes cold and wanting in religious warmth."

In order to worship and partake of the Sacraments together, Christians need not prescribe either forms or theories and yet the time will surely come when, just as they now sing their hymns together, they will, upon occasions, express their unity by accepting one another's forms "in spirit and in truth, for the Father seeketh such to worship Him." Members of the Stockholm gatherings will recall especially the singing together of the great hymns of the church, with the sense of uttering a common confession of faith.

To permit human theories of worship and sacrament longer to divide the Christian churches is nothing less than apostasy from the very spiritual reality which they express. It is heartening to find a new note at a Quadrennial of the Federal Council in the report of its Committee on Worship:

"The Committee has no thought of trying to standardize forms of worship or of urging the adoption of any one type of service. It seeks rather to foster an appreciation of the contributions made by the different historic communions to our common heritage of Christian worship.

"The question is raised in some quarters whether the present renewal of interest in worship may not indicate a decline in the sense of prophetic mission and ethical emphasis. The Committee on Worship holds that the opposite is the case and that the new concern for worship is a heartening sign of a revival of Christian faith and spiritual vitality. It is convinced, moreover, that worship and ethical teaching need each other. Worship must furnish the stimulus to higher ethical standards, give motive and inspiration to serve human needs and save the social emphasis from superficiality by keeping it rooted deep in the consciousness of God and of His purpose for the world. The concern for human welfare and a better social order, in their turn, should strengthen the note of reality in worship and keep worship vitally related to the daily needs of men. . . .

"We note with deep satisfaction the greatly increased attention that is being given by the various communions to the question of worship. . . .

"We deplore the tendency in some quarters to set worship and prophetic preaching or ethical teaching in contrast, as if they were antithetical to each other. We think of Christian worship in terms of leading men into such an awareness of God and His character that their faith in spiritual values will be intensified, their purposes become purified and unselfish, and their lives become creatively Christian in all their social relationships. Thus conceived, worship is the basic foundation of the entire Christian life.

"We believe that the strengthening of the spirit and practice of worship should be regarded as a permanent responsibility of the Federal Council and that as soon as it is financially possible the present Committee should be developed into a department with sufficient resources to enable it to render its largest service to the churches. The interest of the Committee, including representatives of the several denominational agencies working in this field, is not in standardizing forms of worship, nor in urging any one type of worship, but rather in fostering an appreciation of the contributions which the different historic churches have made to our common heritage of Christian worship."

SERVICE TO HUMANITY

There has doubtless been an assumption that the social task of the churches, emphasized thus far by the Federal Council and by the Conference on Life and Work at Stockholm, constitutes a sufficient bond and symbol of unity. But, as we have seen, there must be something deeper and more abiding than this in any form of real unity. Social objectives, indeed, may even induce new divisions. Social theories change from age to age and are often in contemporary conflict. They vary among nations and in different sections of the world. We witness this today in such extreme cases as Russia, but also among other European nations, where social ideals have led to the repudiation of Christianity itself.

Indeed, just as philosophy applied to religion has been a divisive factor, so social theories may follow the same course. There must, in any event, be something more profound than the external unity of a common social task, or indeed any outward expression. A set of divisions based on economic or social conceptions would be little, if any, better than our present denominational disunity and might even be worse.

There is undoubtedly the ideal of a synthesis within world-wide human society, developing a genuine Christian ethics. But we must not rely on economic ideas or forces to produce the needed integrity of our common Christianity. We must distinguish between what the church *does* and what it *is*.

On the other hand, over against those who pin their sole faith on what we term social Christianity, we have, as has been noted, a growing body of thinkers who, as the result of the war, believe that they are now disillusioned and have lost faith in social evangelization. They have been led to disparage all efforts to improve our social order, or to regard all such as negligible, so far as Christian faith is concerned. While thus Christianity cannot find its highest existence by any conformity to social theories, it cannot do so by seeking escape, through this new "theology of crisis," from the realities of our social world.

While recognizing, as this volume does, that a socialized gospel is not profound enough to be or to express our essential spiritual unity, we must continue to deal courageously and coöperatively with our social problems in order to find a Christian solution for them. Our viewpoint is from above; our approach is from within; as we seek to guide our social order toward its spiritual ends. Therefore, in this volume, this section follows that on worship and sacraments and is given disproportionate space because it is still a subject of debate.

One wonders, indeed, who it may have been that invented the idea of spiritual culture and social service as antithetical in Christianity, or that the one is mutually exclusive of the other. It is hard to understand what a disciple and exponent of Barthianism means when he affirms that Jesus as an ideal of human life, "has nothing to do with New Testament teaching," that "the historical Jesus is a corpse" and "is of no value to us," or that the message of "the ideal of life which Jesus has preached and lived is no message at all."[13] As we have seen, federal unity has first found itself in the field of social action. Was this providential or is it an approach to be abandoned, for a new Barthian or other philosophy?

Indeed, we touch here upon a question which arose at the Stockholm Conference in 1925, between some European leaders holding what is termed in Continental Europe the eschatological viewpoint and some from the United States who were exponents of the so-called Social Gospel. The same issue appeared at Jerusalem, where Europeans deprecated alleged activism and tendency to religious syncretism. Following the

---

[13] "The Word and the World," by Emil Brunner. Scribners, 1931.

Stockholm conference, writers in *Die Christliche Welt,* a leading German magazine, continued the discussion.

Dr. Adolf Keller, of Geneva, sets forth the two points of view in his volume on the Dialectical Theology and refers to the situation as being "perilous." He himself sees that it is largely a mutual misunderstanding between schools of differing emphases. Our European theologians generally assume too large a place for "humanism" and "behaviorism" in American religious thinking. While doubtless eschatological conceptions among Christians in the United States do not occupy the place that they do among Continental scholars, the differences between American and European Christian ideas are by no means so considerable as the European brethren assume.[14] Christian "life" and living have little in common with behavioristic philosophies.

What is needed is Dr. Keller's gracious and persuasive plea that each learn to translate the other's thought into his own thought-language. It may be earnestly hoped that the Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry and its implications will be carefully studied and seen in perspective by our European associates. Otherwise they may be misled as to the substance of Christian thinking in the United States, especially if they do not adopt Professor Keller's precept.[15]

Professor Charles A. Ellwood, however, in a recent article,[16] tells us that "there is now no use in ignoring the fact that some schools of American sociological thinkers have divorced sociology entirely from social religion and social ethics, a development alien to the spirit of sociology a generation back, whether it was Christian or pagan in its tendencies."

---

[14] The author treated this at length in *Die Christliche Welt* of March 4, 1926, urging that unity be not hindered by substituting differences on social theory for the older theological polemics.

[15] Two recent volumes illustrate the inclusiveness of American thinking: "The Recovery of Worship," and "A Study of Jesus' Own Religion" (the latter dealing with social ideals), by George Walter Fiske. Macmillan, 1931 and 1932.

[16] "Christianity and Recent Tendencies in American Sociology," "Religion in Life"; Spring No. 1932. Quotations following are from this article.

Looking at it from the reverse point of view and quite in contradiction to European critics, another eminent exponent of social life, Rev. Justin Wroe Nixon, a short time ago, in a stimulating and challenging volume,[17] constituting his lectures inaugurating the Walter Rauschenbusch Memorial lectureship at Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, alleged that the period of social Christianity inspired by Rauschenbusch and other prophets came to a close with the World War, that social Christianity has been latterly "under an eclipse" and that "the phrase 'the social gospel' is still in decline and it may never come back."

Professor Ellwood, however, modifies the impression made by his startling statement in attributing this attitude of modern social scientists to "some schools." He tells us that at the same time these schools include ethics as well as religion in the divorce proceedings. When a social scientist ignores ethics as well as religion, it puts him so definitely in "no man's land" that we need hardly reckon with him in the discussion.

This is simply the age-long struggle between idealism and materialism. It reflects, says Professor Ellwood, the human world in general and "we are witnessing the greatest struggle of the ages coming to a climax in our time, the struggle between the material and the spiritual aspects of life." He persuasively appeals to the Church "to take an interest in this struggle in the academic world" because "the Christian Church has a great stake" in it. He fears that "perhaps science will be about the last thing to be humanized and socialized."

Likewise Dr. Nixon, speaking as a churchman, tells us that "we stand today on the watershed of history" and "whether the events of the future will flow down to another dead sea of civilization like that of 1914-1918 or off into open waters, upon which we may safely launch the ventures of a new age, depends largely on the roof of religion which we shall now build above the common life of men." "Either Christians are going to work, under the inspiration of religion, for an order of human life which will constitute a far more adequate realization of the ideals of Jesus, or their religion will be displaced in its appeal to ardent and adventurous spirits" and by such "religions" as Communism. He urges that "the finest minds of Protestantism" be put to work upon a coöperative plan with a new "strategy of progress."

---

[17] "The Moral Crisis in Christianity," by Justin Wroe Nixon. Harper & Bros.

As for the struggle, we have always had both Ormuzd and Ahriman. The main question is, what is the trend of things? To answer this question we must, above all, keep matters in historical perspective over a sufficient area of time and space. So we turn from Professor Ellwood's review of Professor Albert Galloway Keller's [18] "Societal Evolution" with its near-behaviorism and its belief in the control of the blind, automatic forces of nature and from other scientists who talk about "pure" science (whatever that may be), who, to use Ellwood's words, strip sociology "of any ethical impulse or implication" and we look to another school of sociologists as we ponder Jane Addams's "The Second Twenty Years at Hull House," [19] Graham Taylor's "Pioneering on Social Frontiers" [20] and "The Long View," the biography and interpretation of Mary E. Richmond, who told her associates that "we have learned to take the long view, to realize that the very stars in their courses, not our small army alone, are overcoming the weakness and misery of the world." [21]

---

[18] Not to be confused with Adolf Keller.

[19] "The Second Twenty Years at Hull House," by Jane Addams. Macmillan, 1930.

[20] "Pioneering on Social Frontiers," by Graham Taylor. University of Chicago Press, 1930.

[21] "The Long View," edited by Joanna C. Colcord and Ruth Z. Mann. Russell Sage Foundation, 1930.

Thus there are two schools of social scientists and what the Albert G. Keller school sadly needs is the empirical teaching of the school of Addams, Taylor and Richmond. We need to learn to hold long views, while acting on short distances, and we must not lose perspective by permitting the rough spots of the road to obscure the main highway, whether looking backward or forward. We need to pause at times to look both ways.

Perhaps it may be permitted the writer, who has reached the age of progressive retirement from the short-distance action, to take on the mood of reflection, and to look backward to see what a quarter of a century or more of progress, if there has been such, may presage for the long view of the future. He could perhaps easily take the apparently more apprehensive views of both Ellwood and Nixon, were he now, with them, still called upon to act day by day on the short-distance demand. He recently listened, to be sure, to the professor of social science of an outstanding college for women, as he told three hundred young girls that religion had always had either a retarding effect or no effect at all in social progress. He is not unfamiliar, either, with those of his associates in the gospel ministry who might be used as examples in support of the professor's undiscriminating assertion.

The Christian churches have not always been followers rather than leaders. In fact, as one reviews recent analyses of "Present Social Trends Affecting Religion" and "Church Adaptations to Changing Social Conditions" in a recent volume,[22] it appears that religious leaders have taken things into their own hands and have become social scientists or sociologists themselves, whichever term you choose to use. The assumption that there is any such thing as "pure science," at least in the social realm, is futile. It is an attempt to see the grin without the cat, or to deduce an animated but spiritless body, or to find the meaning of something which it is first admitted has no meaning.

---

[22] "The Social Work of the Churches; a Handbook of Information," edited by F. E. Johnson, Department of Research of the Federal Council.

When thus religious leaders turn historians and sociologists, keeping close to human life itself, they reach conclusions such as those in the volume just referred to; "the social scientists and social workers are taking large account of those forces which integrate personality and supply 'drives' for energetic living—forces which we call spiritual. This trend is apparent, in spite of the preoccupation in many academic circles and in popular literature with a mechanistic type of psychology." "The cleavage, within the Church, between those who emphasize the individual elements of Christianity and those who are preoccupied with the social ideals of the 'Kingdom' still exists, but it is apparently in the way of being removed. The conflict which it represents is slowly being resolved by the recognition that the individual and social elements are equally essential parts of a total spiritual experience." "Another fact of importance . . . is the spiritual view of life that is emerging among great scientists. It is now a commonplace that the older materialistic and mechanistic concepts of physics have been abandoned in favor of a dynamic view of the world in which religion finds itself very much in accord. One needs but to glance at the writings of Pupin, Millikan, Whitehead and Eddington to verify this observation."

An institution, like an individual, may be estimated by its enemies. The churches, or rather their social leaders, or both, have been the constant objects of attack from privileged and powerful sources of social reaction. The reply of these church bodies has been a constantly revised statement of social principles with ever enlarging scope and increasing incisiveness. Witness the unflinching reports on industrial situations, often from united Protestant, Catholic and Jewish bodies, now appearing from time to time.

But an institution is also to be evaluated by its friends. The writer recalls the sensation among clergy and press in Boston when on a Sunday afternoon, thirty years ago, he attended and addressed a labor union meeting. He contrasts this with the friendly exchanges between Labor and the Church every Labor Sunday, which was instituted by one of their leaders, Rev. Charles Stelzle, and is now universally recognized by the churches. He also contrasts his own hearty reception by the Federation of Labor at its Boston meeting a short time ago, with that first occasion in the same city, when he met hostile countenances and near contempt.

Professor Nixon regards the post-war period as one of decline. But let us remember that, while up to two decades ago practically every church body, excepting Quakers and Mennonites, had assumed war and their support of their nation in it as matters of course, today the church bodies, both denominational and interdenominational, with few exceptions, are leading the peace movement, are standing up for conscientious objectors and are being cursed by over-hilarious admirals and generals and by super-nationalistic congressmen and are being "exposed" by the paid agents of warship builders.

Let us estimate this social growth by geographical dimensions. On the shores of Lake Geneva, working in coöperation with the International Labor Organization, is the Universal Christian Council's International Christian Social Institute, and the similar body of the International Missionary Council.

When we come to note the effect of this religious social renaissance on the churches and their relationships, its power and effectiveness are revealed in the unification of the Protestant churches in the Federal Council and affiliated bodies, and, in addition, the enlarging coöperation of these with Catholic and Hebrew agencies. There must be something very vital in a social passion which, within a quarter century, thus unites bodies which had been growing apart for centuries. Indeed, one sometimes wonders if things may not be getting outside or beyond the natural processes of evolution and whether or not the present radical tendencies of the churches in the fight against the war system of nations may not recede before stubborn realities.

But let us see then if we may discover the meaning of what Professor Nixon feels to be a waning of the "social gospel." He deprecates the decreasing use of that term, but may not that be explained by the fact that this gospel has so largely become the gospel itself, with less need of a descriptive title? To be sure there has been the so-called fundamentalist backward wave. But there is some evidence that this is becoming a spent force in its attack on social interpretations of the Gospel. The new Barthian theology in Europe, in its near contempt of social Christianity, may be little more than one of those temporary disillusionments that follow such a catastrophe as the war, leaving men to see human undertakings as hopeless. Indeed, its revision has already been noted. Defeatism often comes as a reaction from over sentimentalism.

There has been also an effort to secure equilibrium by bringing out those spiritual verities, inherently individualistic, which relate to worship and the devotional life and thus escape the pitfalls of humanism. Indeed, there have been Christian social leaders who lost perspective. While some evangelists lost sight of the man in search for his soul, other social evangelists lost sight of his soul for a time. Thus there was a tendency for the Christian social movement to become humanistic if not anthropocentric or materialistic. What sometimes may appear to Dr. Nixon and others a retrogression has often been the effort to put into social evangelization a profounder motive and meaning. Thus it may seem as though the "social gospel" had been obscured just because it has had a light shed upon it which is for the moment blinding.

Then, too, all progress partakes of the cyclical character of evolution and we must not let the long forward sweeps be obscured by the temporary backward eddies and currents, in which, from time to time, we find ourselves disturbed. When seen in perspective, then, there has never been a movement in history which has made any such advance as that of the socialization of the churches in the last twenty-five years, and this record has been distanced in its velocity by the internationalization of the churches in the interest of world justice and peace.

The writer is not so familiar with the subject dealt with by Professor Ellwood. Here we must distinguish, as he helps us to do, between social scientists like Keller of Yale, and Bain, on the one hand, and Hornell Hart, on the other, and we may safely prophesy that Hart's idea of sociology, that its aim is to make men's ethical valuations (and these cannot be separated from spiritual experience) susceptible of a scientific basis, will prevail in human thinking. But, in any case, when it comes to the social scientists who are dealing with humanity itself, the so-called social workers, many of them, like Ellwood himself, are today finding their way into the things of the spirit.

Still more, however, when we go a bit further into the realm of science and watch men like Pupin and Millikan, while we do not find them making any great truce with dogmatic theology, we do discover among them a sense of religious empiricism and a desire to square man's unquestionable spiritual experience with the universe. Scientists no longer deny God because they fail to find Him in the sweep of their telescopes, nor the soul because they cannot analyze it in a test tube. We are thus far from agreement with the Roman Catholic scholar[23] who, under the imprimatus of the Catholic university and the church, has declared that "the principles that underlie sociology are *by necessity* subversive of revealed religion." To declare that is to give away the case to those whose principles are falsely based. We may better stand with Graham Taylor, who in the late evening of his life declares his faith in the social order "in reliance upon a religious motive" and finds "the spirit of God brooding within the darkness upon the face of the deep to bring forth a new and better order of life." We can well afford to be undisturbed by social scientists who have lost their way and to whom the wishes, the purposes, and ideals of men "have little significance in societal evolution" if only those who are seeking courageously to deal with human life and living, whether through institutional religion or through social methods, will but learn of the Master.

---

[23] Hemelt: "Final Moral Values in Sociology." Quoted by Professor Ellwood.

> "He went out into a mountain to pray, and continued all night in prayer to God."
>
> "And when it was day . . . he came down . . . and stood in the plain . . . there went virtue out of him, and healed them all."

Thus he who does the work of a social ministry, whether of thought or action, in the daylight hours of toil, must find his way back, at eventide, to the sources of his strength. There is no lasting, perfected social science without the culture of the spirit, and the one will be as real and abiding as the other is deep and reverent. The deeper man's experience becomes in the realm of the temporal, the profounder is the earnestness of his interest in the infinite and the eternal, as "deep calleth unto deep," if he sees human life in its wholeness.

Therefore we need not be disturbed when Russell Gordon Smith tells us that "life has no meaning, save the meaning one gives it, no value save the value one puts upon it," nor by other "scientists" who allege that sociology is one and the same thing as physical or natural science. One who has been alive to human events in the last fifty years has seen more than one scientific or theological meteorite flash across the horizon only to disappear, leaving little trace, and hence is not overdisturbed by these phenomena. At the same time, we may well heed the earnest pleas of both Professor Ellwood and Dr. Nixon to have a larger awareness of the conflict in the fields of both science and religion and of the human destinies involved, but with a confident faith in the outcome.

Christianity has always been inextricable from the struggle and progress of democracy. Indeed, many of our denominations came into being on social issues.[24] Oftentimes in history the church has given Cæsar more than his due and God less. Scoffers have made the most of their gibe that the church talked brotherhood but practiced it little. The early church conceded a bit too much to Constantine. The Reformation itself became somewhat commercialized and failed to meet the aspirations of the meek and lowly. Just as Jesus selected the uncultured for his twelve disciples, so, more than once, a great religious movement has arisen among the lower elements of our social order, those who were economically disfranchised. Thus, just as the social problem has been the first objective of Christian unity, so it goes a long way, at times, in being a divisive force.

If, however, Professor Nixon's warning should be unheeded, certain results are sure to follow. Our younger generation, captured as it is by a social vision, will fulfill its consecrations elsewhere. Our young people are already doing it. Witness the multitude of women of light and leading who are substituting the League of Women Voters and the Women's Peace organizations in place of the women's work of the churches.

Here is another only partially occupied field in our theological seminaries. As late as 1924, a survey[25] discovered that 82 out of 103 seminaries had no courses relating to the church and industry.

---

[24] "The Social Sources of Denominationalism," by H. Richard Niebuhr. Henry Holt & Co., 1929.

Why, then, the tendency to disparage a Christian social gospel? It is because of the danger that it may lose its anchorage in spiritual harbors. While undoubtedly due in large measure to the philosophical bent of the German mind, the criticism in that country, expressed at Stockholm, of *Amerikanische Aktivismus* or *Diesseits-Religion* is not without its value in warning us against the danger of humanism. The ends of unity will be gained neither by transcendentalism nor by humanism. It is just as bad to run away from the world as to give in to it. Indeed, in his searching book, "A Preface to Morals," Walter Lippmann rebukes the Federal Council for pressing its appeal to a rapacious industry to humanize itself on the ground of self-interest instead of a "Thus saith the Lord." The substance of his searching criticism is that Christians fail to place their social message on religious foundations.

But neither Christian unity nor Christianity itself can survive an unsocialized society. If there is a social task for the churches, then only a unified church can perform it. Social Christianity, however, is an end to be gained through unity, rather than a symbol of unity. A Christian church that cannot unite itself can never unite a warring world in brotherhood. Therefore we may well go down with the Master from our worship and sacrament to the plain of human life and ponder the social ideals of the churches.

The Social Ideals of the Churches

This restatement of Christian principles is the result of four years of study and conference on the part of the agencies of the constituent communions of the Federal Council. Perhaps it may be said to express what is occasionally termed the high central mind of the churches and in any event that of their leading spirits in this area of Christian service. It was approved by the Quadrennial meeting of the Council at Indianapolis, December 8th, 1932. The deepest emotional and spiritual experience of that assembly was the moment when Alfred Williams Anthony, at the age of seventy-three, summoned the gathering to unite in the hymn with which this volume closes, whose writer, Frank Mason North, at the age of eighty-two, presented this progressive declaration of Christian ideals, fulfilling those which, twenty-four years ago, he had submitted to the Council's first quadrennial. Thus do men, under the influence of a Christian wholeness, grow "from grace to grace," and the assumption that spiritual emotion is identified only with individualistic evangelism is too often due largely to the want of social and humanitarian impulse on the part of those who make that presupposition.

---

[25] "Theological Education in America," by Robert L. Kelly. Doran.

While there was some division of judgment upon rather minor issues in the report, the final statement was approved without dissent, as follows:

I. Historical Statement

"At the first meeting of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, held in Philadelphia in December, 1908, its Commission on the Church and Modern Industry presented a report of great historical importance, including the first statement of social ideals to be adopted by the Federal Council, with recommendations which have had far-reaching practical results. Among them was the proposal that there should be organized a Commission on the Church and Social Service. To the Commission created in pursuance of this recommendation has now, after nearly a quarter of a century, been assigned the task of formulating a new statement of social ideals in language appropriate to current thought, and if possible as realistic in spirit as the earlier report.

"In all Protestant churches and Christian associations, and indeed among those of every faith who turn their thoughtful attention to the moral aspect of our modern industrial life, the 'Social Ideals of the Churches' has become almost as familiar as the catechisms were to our fathers.

"The Philadelphia report was introduced by a preamble on the spiritual and ethical authority of Christ:

"The Churches of Christ as represented in this Federal Council accept without reserve and assert without apology the supreme authority of Jesus Christ.

"We are one in Him not only because we together share His spirit, but because we acknowledge His headship. Wherever the path in which He leads crosses other highways, whether marked out by the creeds of commerce, the schools of philosophy, the teachers of social theory, the masters of theology, the agitators for reform, the critics of the Church or the feet of the multitude, His disciples must take all risks and follow Him. Our interpretations of His teaching and purpose are, doubtless, with growing light and new conditions, subject to review and restatement, but no such modification can force or allure the Church to surrender the principle of His absolute authority in the individual heart and in the associated life of men.

"The Social Creed, as it was popularly called, appears as the ninth section of this report:

"We deem it the duty of all Christian people to concern themselves directly with certain practical industrial problems. To us it seems that the churches must stand:

"For equal rights and complete justice for all men in all stations of life.

"For the right of all men to the opportunity for self-maintenance, a right ever to be wisely and strongly safeguarded against encroachments of every kind. For the right of workers to some protection against the hardships often resulting from the swift crises of industrial change.

"For the principle of conciliation and arbitration in industrial dissensions.

"For the protection of the worker from dangerous machinery, occupational disease, injuries and mortality.

"For the abolition of child labor.

"For such regulation of the conditions of toil for women as shall safeguard the physical and moral health of the community.

"For the suppression of the "sweating system."

"For the gradual and reasonable reduction of the hours of labor to the lowest practicable point; and for that degree of leisure for all which is a condition of the highest human life.

"For a release from employment one day in seven.

"For a living wage as a minimum in every industry, and for the highest wage that each industry can afford.

"For the most equitable division of the products of industry that can ultimately be devised.

"For suitable provision for the old age of the workers and for those incapacitated by injury.

"For the abatement of poverty.

"This declaration of ideals, in essentially this form first framed by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in May, 1908, adopted in modified form by the Federal Council in 1908, supplemented, revised, and readopted as a social platform in Chicago in 1912, at each later quadrennial meeting has been ratified and reaffirmed. In its present form the declaration stands as follows:

"The Churches stand for:

I. Equal rights and justice for all men in all stations of life.
II. Protection of the family by the single standard of purity, uniform divorce laws, proper regulation of marriage, proper housing.
III. The fullest possible development of every child, especially by the provision of education and recreation.
IV. Abolition of child labor.
V. Such regulation of the conditions of toil for women as shall safeguard the physical and moral health of the community.
VI. Abatement and prevention of poverty.
VII. Protection of the individual and society from the social, economic, and moral waste of the liquor traffic.
VIII. Conservation of health.
IX. Protection of the worker from dangerous machinery, occupational diseases, and mortality.
X. The right of all men to the opportunity for self-maintenance, for safeguarding this right against encroachments of

every kind, for the protection of workers from the hardships of enforced unemployment.

XI. Suitable provision for the old age of the workers, and for those incapacitated by injury.

XII. The right of employees and employers alike to organize; and for adequate means of conciliation and arbitration in industrial disputes.

XIII. Release from employment one day in seven.

XIV. Gradual and reasonable reduction of hours of labor to the lowest practicable point, and for that degree of leisure for all which is a condition of the highest human life.

XV. A living wage as a minimum in every industry, and for the highest wage that each industry can afford.

XVI. A new emphasis upon the application of Christian principles to the acquisition and use of property, and for the most equitable division of the product of industry that can ultimately be devised.

"These social ideals, in identical or slightly different language, have been adopted from time to time not only by the Federal Council itself but by constituent bodies of the Council—the major denominations of Protestant Christianity—as a practical working program. This present report is brought to a close with recommendations cast in harmony with this evolution. Throughout this revision, as from the beginning, the supreme spiritual and ethical authority of Jesus is assumed.

"Your Commission recognizes that there is a subtle danger in all such periodical pronouncements which have any show of authority. They may even, if improperly used, make for mental laziness, for a half-unconscious insincerity, or a static concept of Christian responsibility, or for complacency, as if the formulation of a statement had accomplished its object. This statement is not intended to provide a creed. It is rather intended as a contribution to the process of meeting problems by creating programs; and the value of a program is to be determined only by acting on it and candidly observing and profiting by the result. This statement is intended to aid and stimulate—not to replace private judgment and group thinking.

"That these ideals are in essential harmony with prophetic and apostolic teachings is to be expected. That they are in large measure shared by great religious groups besides those represented in the Federal Council adds to their social meaning and significance. This in no way detracts, however, from the fact that for these Christian churches their authority and inspiration is to be found in the way of life which Jesus taught and exemplified.

II. The Social Order and the Good Life

"The Christian social ideal is one of a good life, abundant, progressive, and generously devoted to human welfare—a life lived 'under the eye and by the strength of God.' It implies satisfaction in work as in leisure. Deadening and injurious occupations and conditions of work are inconsistent with it; so also are stultifying, stupefying, injurious indulgences in time of leisure. In economic terms, the Christian ideal demands a basic standard of living for the masses of the people, adequate to assure security and freedom for the development of spiritual values. It means sound education both of mind and will, so that one may know the better and choose it; so that one may know what is the higher good and prefer it. The Christian religion has many precious aids to finding and living the good life; but even the most devout Christian can make progress in the good life only by the constant use of intelligent and critical judgment. He must have an appreciation of values and learn from his own experience and that of others. A high standard of living implies opportunity for growth in this process of choice and judgment.

"The gravest of all our present social evils, the most insidious and widespread, is the encroachment of crude and cheap materialistic standards on our cultural and spiritual life. We face a new era of vandalism, in which perverted tastes and vulgar ambitions prevail. Low standards and a lack of critical intelligence are found in an appalling degree in every class of society. The exaltation of poverty, or at least a return to plain living, might again be proclaimed as the remedy if by that we could understand, as St. Francis did, the voluntary renunciation of selfish indulgence in favor of a rich spiritual life. If we acclaim, instead, the total abolition of poverty, in the sense of a lack of the necessities of life, this is entirely consistent with the ideal which Jesus and all His true disciples have taught and realized. What is required is a spiritual rebirth. This will be manifest in a special concern for wage-earners and their families, and in a steadfast persistence in the search for security and justice.

"The churches have a definite obligation to resist the lower standards and to promote the ideal of the good life as inherent in the gospel, both by social and educational activities of their own and by fruitful coöperation with one another and with voluntary or governmental agencies created for the purpose, such as schools, libraries, museums, welfare societies, health centers, coöperative associations, and labor unions.

"The churches should know what the social conditions of their own communities are, by comparison with clearly formulated ideals and standards, and by comparison with what is attainable, as shown by conditions in comparable communities; and they should be in close and helpful relations with every *bona fide* effort to improve those conditions and thus to realize the Christian ideal in the relations of men with men. The churches should not only support community agencies and coöperate with them in social work, but should also develop the best current standards in their own institutional and parish work. They should make spiritual resources available for the help of individuals and for the improvement of social conditions.

"Lawlessness, especially when it has become organized and professional, is evidence of the inadequacy of our present methods of dealing with crime. It reveals also the effects of unfavorable environment, bad housing, overcrowding, lack of opportunities for play. It is even clearer evidence of low standards, of the gulf between our practices and the pretensions of our statutes. This gulf should be bridged by a more widespread and a more telling moral and religious training. The existence of defiant and shameless bands of criminals in any community would hardly be possible without the connivance and participation of able minds, clever in finance, in law, and in politics. The churches have a duty to deal with such sinners in high places; to protest against low ethical standards in the professions; to encourage the efforts of those who try to make the civil and criminal laws deal adequately and promptly with all alike, rich or poor, native or alien. They have an even more elementary duty to protect their children from early contamination and perversion.

"Christianity renounces violence and relies upon the restraining and educational power of love. It does not therefore, for the prevention of crime, expect beneficent results from capital punishment, brutal police methods, severity of sentences; but rather from preventive education, inculcation of due regard for the law, respect for personality, service to neighbors and coöperation with them, educational reform of youthful offenders, correctional schools and colonies built upon the principle of reclamation, appropriate treatment for the morally irresponsible, and the creation of righteous institutions and relations among men. All these are extensions of the principle of redemption into the sphere of crime.

"To secure the good life the Christian religion relies above all on the education, nurture, and protection of its children. The right should be recognized to be born free from such taints as alcoholism and venereal disease, free also from the handicaps of insanity and mental defect. Such rights, although fundamental to human welfare, are not to be won by any single decree or legislative act. They are to be won only by patient scientific investigation and experiment, by educational preparation for marriage, by wise regulation of the marital and parental relation, by the new skills which are coming to the support of the family. Child welfare demands the preparation of everyone for work suited to his abilities and of value to society, and for spending income beneficially both to the individual and to the community. Ultimately education must be integrated with industry, but this should be done on education's terms rather than on industry's terms. The complete abolition of child labor remains to be accomplished. No children under sixteen years of age should be employed for wages, and from sixteen to eighteen years of age, or even until full legal maturity, those who do not remain in school should nevertheless, in employment, remain under such supervision as will promote educational development. The welfare of the child demands supremely his own realization of his spiritual inheritance.

"Children should not be removed from their homes merely because of insufficient family income. Social insurance for sickness and unemployment, and allowances to the mothers of fatherless children may replace the normal earnings of the wage earner. Even in an ideal social order, however, there would be children who, temporarily or for long periods, need foster care in family homes or in institutions. Each child in need of such care should have patient, discriminating, and skillful individual attention. The protection of children from abuse and neglect should be guaranteed by legislation and by competent administrative agencies, whether official or voluntary.

"Child welfare presupposes a wholesome family life, and as an essential means to this end, the provision of dwellings of such type and character as will symbolize the family as the basic unit in society and will provide for family activities. The one-family house offers advantages in its hospitality to children and in facilities for their development as members of the family; but in any case the dwelling should be so constructed and equipped as to permit decent living arrangements and to safeguard health. There should be play spaces, and in the city supervised playgrounds, near every home. Rationally planned communities are conducive to a wholesome family life, to the welfare of children, and to the realization of every high social ideal.

"Our social life becomes ever more complex, and it offers ever enlarging areas for coöperation. The religious passion of love meets the challenge of these new demands by calling to its aid increasingly the techniques of science for analysis of the factors involved. It demands that our developing resources shall be so organized as to minister to the life of all people and to brotherly relations among them; that a world organization shall be built which will not only renounce war but make for increasing fellowship among the peoples of all nations and races; and that our educational forces shall be so conceived and used as to train human beings for participation in a world increasingly complex and increasingly rich in opportunity for coöperative enterprise. The churches have an obligation to prepare their members for world citizenship both by increasing their knowledge and by developing the necessary changes of attitude.

"While the Christian ideal thus demands the new and better social order which is made possible by the techniques of modern science, it has always a message of hope and consolation for those who are troubled and perplexed: a gospel of joy and strength, and deliverance from temptation. The social gospel emphasizes and magnifies the individual and his personal needs.

"Any detailed statement of ideals must be relevant to the conditions of the time; and in view of the striking and far-reaching changes now taking place in our social and economic order, this should be clearly understood in connection with the following sections.

ECONOMIC RELATIONS

"The teachings of Christ which bear on economics are not expressed in technical terms; but deal primarily with motives and human values. They are therefore the more searching and timeless. They center upon the priceless worth of the humblest human being; the fundamental place in life of love even to enemies. They give supreme emphasis to the motive of service as over against self-seeking: "Whosoever would become great among you, shall be your minister; and whosoever would be first among you, shall be servant of all."

"There is here no mere exaltation of humility, but a positive insistence upon the dedication of talent to human welfare. The motive of service supplants the desire for gain. These teachings strike at the root of the exploitation of human life and of natural resources, against concentration of wealth, against extravagant living, against the autocratic use of power. They forecast the industry of the future, which will be positively dedicated to the economic plenty of mankind.

"The present economic organization of society is complicated and cannot be accurately described in easy general phrases. That our present economic system breaks down, however, at vital points, will not be denied. The evidences are unmistakable.

"First of these are the recurring depressions with severe and prolonged unemployment. The industrial mechanism does not function in the use of the natural resources and the productive capacity of the nation in such a way as to meet obvious human needs adequately or even fairly.

"Next in evidence are the shocking inequalities of income. No doubt there is a relation between these two phenomena. Too large a share of the national income goes to those who must invest it, if it is to be profitable to them, in activities which are already over-developed, and over-capitalized. Too small a share goes to those who would use it for food, clothing, housing, and other necessities or comforts of life. Ultimate consumers, if they had more income, would create an effective demand for commodities which are useful but which cannot be sold.

"The Christian ideal calls for hearty support of a planned economic system in which maximum social values shall be sought. It demands that coöperation shall supplant competition as the fundamental method. It assumes the principle that the personalities of human beings are of more value than their labor power and deserve prior consideration.

"The ideal calls for a vigorous educational program enlisting all the resources of the community: trained economists, social engineers, leaders in business and labor, in religion and education. The churches should be ready for a warm-hearted coöperation with every sincere attempt of forward-looking pioneers to build a better order, and they should themselves become a source of inspiration for such effort.

"Special honor should be accorded to those who—whether as employers or as industrial workers, as law-makers or as judges, as public teachers or as lobbyists, as preachers, editors, or politicians, as business men or as labor leaders—are able to change the economic order for the better, to make it more rational, more productive, more humane, more righteous.

"The economic order of today, whether we like that fact or not, is fundamentally international. Tariffs, international debts, foreign investments may have far-reaching internal consequences. No lasting beneficial progress can be made which fails to recognize that all nations, however diverse and self-dependent they may seem to be, are in essential respects bound together in an emerging world order.

"Gambling on the results of games and other incidents has brought unchristian and anti-social motives into the ascendancy and tends to establish false standards of life, the individual seeking to be relieved of responsibility, arduous tasks or creative work. This attitude culminates in a supreme endeavor to acquire wealth through and by speculation, with no personal contribution to society. Gambling permeates all society, breeds criminals, is directly responsible for broken fortunes, broken homes, defalcations and suicides. This mania for gambling has come to a climax in a debauch of stock speculation. This is not only non-creative, but it is destructive, relocating and redistributing wealth with no regard whatever for the genius and energy that created it.

Industrial Relations

"The relation of employer and worker is of fundamental importance. The large majority of our population depend for their maintenance and conditions of living upon wages or salaries paid for services under a formal or an implied contract. Where this obtains, the Christian spirit calls for a just and reasonable as well as a free contract, of which the so-called 'individual' contract, which requires the worker to sign away his elementary right, is unjustifiable perversion.

"Industrial democracy is a goal comparable to that of political democracy. Both are relative terms. There is more than one way of making progress toward their realization. In one stage of development, coöperation through collective agreements between the representatives of management and of workers, counseled by technical experts, may be the most advantageous. Even in this elementary form of industrial relations, the right of workers to organize and to be represented by counsel or agents of their own free choice must be recognized as fundamental. In another stage, participation of workers in management may be possible and desirable; in another, workers might provide their own capital and assume full responsibility; in still another, the government might assume and exercise the powers of ownership, control, and management for the common good.

"In any case industry should bear the costs of the problems which it creates. Unemployment, for example, is incident to the development of our present industrial system. Security against want due to illness, to permanent disability from invalidism, and to old age, is an elementary condition for a sound economic system, but is still lacking. Heretofore in America we have expected workers to find such security for themselves, relying upon high wages and cheap land to furnish the means. We have not recognized that unemployment and occupational disease are familiar aspects of the prevailing industrial system; and that, even though skilled workers have on the whole larger real incomes than before, there is no reasonable possibility that all can provide against such contingencies from their own earnings, and that therefore the need for systems of insurance, socially administered, is urgent. Industry must clearly provide a reserve for the support of wage earners and their families in periods of unemployment. The notion that social insurance would saddle an impossible burden upon industry is not true and its falsity must be made clear. As it is, the victims of unemployment, of poverty in old age, and of disability themselves bear the full force of the burden of their years or their misfortune, or else the burden falls back upon the charity of the community.

In preventing them from being crushed by such burdens, as has been accomplished in workmen's compensation and in recent laws for old-age security, society will save individuals and will contribute to its own economic well-being.

The Rural Problem

"In the economic history of the United States the dominant fact has been that agricultural land could be had at the frontier at little or no expense by those who knew how to make a living from it. With the disappearance of the western frontier, the displacement of farm labor by labor-saving machinery, and the increasing severity of competition in the world markets for the sale of surplus farm products, the economic distress of many farmers has become unbearable.

"Farm products may bring far less than it costs to produce them or may not be salable at any price. Agricultural depression, so disastrous to the rural population, affects also the town-dwellers, whose standard of living has been more secure because of the possibility of "going back to the land."

"In many rural localities there are evidences of desperate poverty. In many places there is resentment because of a belief that national policies have deliberately favored manufacturers, merchants, and bankers, and have ignored the just claims of farmers. There is a growing suspicion that, even among radical and progressive reformers, cheap food for the urban masses and cheap raw materials are considered of greater importance than remunerative return to original producers. Everywhere is found exasperation because prices paid by the ultimate consumers, whether in the city or on the farm, bear so little relation to necessary original costs.

"On the other hand, the farmer is usually still a sturdy individualist and a firm believer in democratically owned homesteads. He wants at the same time personal freedom and economic encouragement. He wants to market his foods, just as the organized laborer wants to bargain collectively, with self-determination but also with the advantages of an orderly disposal of surplus products. The solution of these problems is not easy but it is imperative.

"Diminished buying power of industrial workers here and abroad is a main cause of the fall in the prices of farm products. Unemployment and low wages in mine or factory destroy agricultural prosperity just as diminished buying power of farmers hurts industry and business.

"The vicious circle can be broken by a change of the right kind either in industry or in agriculture. The churches can with equal propriety advocate economic and social justice for the farmer and for the industrial worker. They can make their voice heard in favor of a better economic order in which tariffs, taxes, transportation rates, the production of food and raw materials, and the disposal of surplus products shall be determined with reference to the common welfare. The social direction of agricultural, mineral, and industrial production, either by the government or by some other form of social organization in which private individual profit is subordinated to the common good, is clearly indicated by the plight to which agriculture has been reduced.

"There are unique values in rural life which American public opinion has always emphasized. These values should be preserved. The rural home and the farm linked with it have never been generally regarded merely as a means of speculative profit. They should not become so. Land is a very special kind of property even though it may be bought and sold. It is the source of food, of raw materials. It provides for healthful homes. Organization among farmers is essential for the best use of land, quite as much as for the maintenance of prices.

"The rural church has an opportunity to influence public opinion beneficially on the broader agricultural interests and also on the specific problems of farm laborers and tenant farmers. It can effectively insist that rural children shall have educational and religious opportunities equal to the best; that there shall be adequate facilities for health, social welfare, and recreation in all rural communities. Urban churches may support such demands and help to see that they are met by just taxation, a generous sharing of surplus wealth, and a rational coöperation between urban and rural forces.

Marriage and the Home

"The Christian ideal demands the full emancipation of women from legal, social, political, and economic disabilities. The fears often felt as women gained the right to own property on equal terms with men, to enter occupations formerly closed to them, to make contracts, to enter the professions, to vote, to hold office, and to serve on juries, have proved without foundation. Freedom from such disabilities is not only compatible with the best and highest, the most satisfying and fruitful relations between the sexes, but is essential to them and to the highest personal development of both men and women. For both there must be a satisfactory adjustment of vocational interests with family duties. The Christian ideal of love and marriage is based upon the love of one man for the one woman and of one woman for the one man; and it is incompatible with the subordination of either.

"A large number of modern marriages obviously fail to enrich the lives of one or both participants. Success in marriage as in other human relationships demands patience, self-denial, and a willingness to learn from experience. There is need of wisdom, special training, and tact in those to whom husband or wife may turn for advice in what they feel to be insuperable difficulties. Something more than the exercise of individual and traditional virtues is needed to cope with the new problems of understanding and conduct. Careful study of possible adjustments and greatly improved education must be encouraged.

"Substantial results of the scientific study of sex life are already available. Out of the very wealth of what may be called clinical experience in this field, there is emerging the possibility of a constructive approach to the problems of sex and marriage. In this area of experience where old customs are changing in response to changing conditions of life, care should be taken not to discard past social experiences merely because they come from the past, and equal care must be taken to protect an emerging experience which gives promise of enriching our common life and which may some day be institutionalized.

"It is the clear duty of the churches to offer to their young people opportunities for wholesome friendship, guidance in forming their life attachment, training for marriage and home-making, and information—by the time of marriage, if it has not been given before—on biology, physiology, and emotional reactions. Opportunity should also be given them to consult qualified advisers—the minister, or a physician, the director of religious education, or other specialist—who, besides having a clear grasp of the fundamental principles of sex morality, would have also an appreciation of modern tendencies and would be in a position to offer rational advice.

"Any form of marriage which from the start contemplates divorce is incompatible with the Christian ideal and with the clearest lessons of human experience. The most beautiful and satisfying experiences are for those who, having chosen wisely their life partners, achieve a life-long marriage with ever deepening love and loyalty. That such a union, dissolved only by death, and unspoiled by the memory of premarital indulgences or by degrading episodes after marriage, is best for the children of the household, would be admitted even by severe critics of the institution of marriage as it exists. The Christian ideal holds it to be best also for the parents and for those who, although childless, regard their marriage as involving a spiritual as well as a physical relation. Divorce or separation may be preferable to the enforced continuance of a relation which has no true basis in mutual respect and affection as far as the two individuals are concerned, but the effect upon children, the family and society must never be ignored or minimized. Moreover, it is evidence of failure, always to be deplored, and to be avoided if by any means success can be achieved even over what may appear insurmountable obstacles.

"Wholesome development of children can be expected only when they are born with a normal equipment in mind and body, to parents who desire them or accept them with love when they come, and who are able to provide affection, sustenance, and education. The problems related to maternal health as affected by child-bearing, and the whole subject of the spacing of children and limitation of the size of families, which has unfortunately become involved in acrimonious controversy, should be reëxamined dispassionately, from the point of view of morality and hygiene, with due regard to the best means of maintaining desirable standards of living and fully discharging the fundamental obligations of parents to each other and to their children.

Race Relations

"Relations between races have often been characterized by prejudice, antagonism, fear, cruelty, injustice, exploitation. But racial differences need have none of these consequences. The likenesses between races—the characteristics which the majority in each group have in common with those of other groups—are more numerous and more important than their differences.

"The ideal demands more than the condemnation of gross injustice and cruelty. It calls for right thought and action as well as words; for appreciation and respect for human personality in every racial, national, and religious group; for the disappearance of social prejudice and of economic and political disadvantage for any individual or group on account of race, creed, or color; for equality in educational, social, and economic opportunities; and for friendship, mutual goodwill, and active coöperation among racial and national groups. Even though the mass yields its prejudices slowly there should be free and glad coöperation between individuals and groups of different races and religions.

"It is obvious that a very large proportion of the colored races in the United States are rightly dissatisfied with existing race relations; that visitors and residents of other races and of other nations often encounter denial of equal opportunities; and that the economic and social costs of such racial discrimination rest heavily upon all concerned. The steadily increasing nation-wide condemnation of lynching and other deeds of outrageous injustice and violence is a source of satisfaction. But social justice, respect, encouragement, and coöperation in life and work far beyond that which now exists in the United States, must be insured for all who live and work here.

International Relations

"International relations are entering on a new stage, in which the nations have condemned recourse to war for the solution of international controversies and have renounced it as an instrument of national policy, agreeing that the settlement of all their disputes shall be sought only by pacific means. The churches give their intelligent and hearty support to these ideals and pledges of governments, and have an obligation to help make them effective.

"Whatever justification for war may have been alleged in time past, the present and discernible future belong to peace. The nations may now know and understand one another. Means of communication have so increased that isolation and national provincialism are not only absurdities but are fraught with danger. Cultural, social, and commercial interests constantly cross national boundaries. International coöperation is easier and more necessary than in earlier times. New barriers are created from time to time, but they are no longer beyond human analysis and control. International jealousies and frictions now occur in the light of day, subject to scrutiny of competent criticism. Methods of reconciling differences and promoting coöperation have been devised and are now in frequent use. They must become the universal practice.

"The war system is inconsistent with all Christian ideals. In war, mercy, righteousness, justice, truthfulness, self-control, coöperation, are abandoned or practiced only toward friends. Religion should no longer sanction war. While works of spiritual ministry and relief of human suffering are at all times the duty of the Church, the institutions of religion should never again be used as agencies of warfare. The social ideal, based upon the brotherhood of man and the sacredness of personality, should be consistently applied in international as in other human relations. Religious bodies should henceforth use their utmost influence in the support of such programs and policies as will make for justice, goodwill, and peace between nations. They should oppose compulsory military training in educational institutions and should support aggressively national and international policies of peace and disarmament. The churches should minister spiritual comfort and sympathy to those who in obedience to the dictates of conscience refuse to participate in war.

"We are clearly in the process of building a more closely knit world-society on the effectiveness of which must depend the final abolition of war and of costly economic rivalries and conflicts. The larger interests and solidarity of nations are involved in its progress. To accomplish these great objectives requires the coöperation not of governments alone but of the social institutions of nations, including the churches. International friendship and coöperation with the churches of other lands should become an inseparable part of the program of religious work in the United States.

The Method by Which the Christian Ideal Is to Be Realized

"Thus far the present statement has been concerned with Christian ideals, ethical standards, and goals of endeavor; and the summary declaration to follow will likewise deal mainly with the social ideals of the churches. Hardly less important than our ideals, however, is the spirit in which our ideals are cherished, the methods by which goals are to be attained, the procedure to be followed in attaining any clearly desirable end. An end desirable in itself may be sought in a belligerent, truculent spirit wholly alien to the true Christian attitude. This attitude is to be maintained even when there is undoubted need for courageous denunciation of oppression or injustice. It is ever consistent with the Christian spirit to recognize that there is a valid place for social restraint and for collective support for the rights of the weak.

"While refusing to compromise with evil, the distinctively Christian approach to the individual is still one of sympathetic understanding. The churches have the opportunity and obligation to promote the spirit and practice of conference: the fellowship of diverse groups for open-minded and frank discussion, and patient inquiry for facts as a basis for judgment. The whole idea of private judgment, so conspicuous in Protestantism, implies an obligation on the part of the individual Christian to know the facts upon which his judgment rests, to avoid actions and decisions which rest merely upon prejudice and partial or misleading information, and to grow in critical intelligence. It implies also the right of free discussion and the protection of individuals and groups in the expression of their opinions even when these opinions conflict with generally accepted views and standards. In areas of conflict, the Church should discountenance violence, and seek ways of expressing the distinctive Christian principle of suffering with and on behalf even of those who are most guilty of causing the conflict. In our thoughts, as well as in our actions, we should steadily strive to do unto others as we would that they should do unto us; and we should strive by conference and by coöperative thinking to get an ever better basis for what we desire both for ourselves and for others.

"The conference method here recommended is only an application of the Christian ideal of love. The social ideal is not alone a goal. It is a challenge. It demands the development of standards, the enrichment of life; and, to these ends, the dauntless courage of a personal devotion.

III. The Churches Should Stand For

"1. Practical application of the Christian principle of social well-being to the acquisition and use of wealth; subordination of speculation and the profit motive to the creative and coöperative spirit.

"2. Social planning and control of the credit and monetary systems and the economic processes for the common good.

"3. The right of all to the opportunity for self-maintenance; a wider and fairer distribution of wealth; a living wage, as a minimum, and above this a just share for the worker in the product of industry and agriculture.

"4. Safeguarding of all workers, urban and rural, against harmful conditions of labor and occupational injury and disease.

"5. Social insurance against sickness, accident, want in old age and unemployment.

"6. Reduction of hours of labor as the general productivity of industry increases; release from employment at least one day in seven, with a shorter working week in prospect.

"7. Such special regulation of the conditions of work of women as shall safeguard their welfare and that of the family and the community.

"8. The right of employees and employers alike to organize for collective bargaining and social action; protection of both in the exercise of this right; the obligation of both to work for the public good; encouragement of coöperatives and other organizations among farmers and other groups.

"9. Abolition of child labor; adequate provision for the protection, education, spiritual nurture and wholesome recreation of every child.

"10. Protection of the family by the single standard of purity; educational preparation for marriage, home-making and parenthood.

"11. Economic justice for the farmer in legislation, financing of agriculture, transportation and the price of farm products as compared with the cost of machinery and other commodities which he must buy.

"12. Extension of the primary cultural opportunities and social services now enjoyed by urban populations to the farm family.

"13. Protection of the individual and society from the social, economic and moral waste of any traffic in intoxicants and habit-forming drugs.

"14. Application of the Christian principle of redemption to the treatment of offenders; reform of penal and correctional methods and institutions, and of criminal court procedure.

"15. Justice, opportunity and equal rights for all; mutual good-will and coöperation among racial, economic and religious groups.

"16. Repudiation of war, drastic reduction of armaments, participation in international agencies for the peaceable settlement of all controversies; the building of a coöperative world order.

"17. Recognition and maintenance of the rights and responsibilities of free speech, free assembly, and a free press; the encouragement of free communication of mind with mind as essential to the discovery of truth.

IV. A New Age of Faith

"No one can contemplate the profound social changes involved in any successful carrying out of these Social Ideals without realizing that, while they would mean great advances in human welfare and happiness, they make unprecedented demands upon the intellectual and moral capacity both of individual leaders and of the whole people. The significance of these demands is the greater since the Ideals express not only religious opinion but aspirations and goals which are stirring the heart of the world.

"We may legitimately expect that the collective mind of the nation will be equal to the intellectual and administrative tasks involved, especially under the stress of critical social conditions, if the moral qualities required are present in sufficient power. What our people lack is neither material resources nor technical skill—these we have in superabundance—but a dedication to the common good, a courage and an unselfishness greater than are now manifest in American life. The tasks are beyond us and their accomplishment will be indefinitely delayed or frustrated, unless there can be a nation-wide spiritual awakening which has social goals. Our supreme social need is spiritual awakening.

"But a new Age of Faith, expressing its devotion in a social passion great enough to inspire the people to undertake these stupendous tasks, cannot center upon the fortunes of the Church itself, nor upon any form of ecclesiastical control over society. It must be a manifestation of spiritual forces called out of the common life by the Spirit of God, called, let us hope, by the prophetic teaching of a consecrated Church, having as its objective the more abundant economic, cultural and spiritual life of humanity.

"In our extremity, arising out of harrowing social conditions throughout the world, we therefore turn anew to Christ; for the faith of great endeavor, for an overwhelming disclosure of God in the life of humanity, for the dedication of innumerable individuals to the creation of a more Christian social order, and for the assurance that what needs to be done, with God's help can be done."

It may not be without significance that this Quadrennial meeting of the Federal Council, at the same time, approved a report of the Committee on Function and Structure including for the first time a department on Worship and the Devotional Life. "What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."

Since these ideals were set forth, we have a seeming support to Dr. Nixon's admonitions in the near-Barthian conclusions of Professor Reinhold Niebuhr,[26] who comes pretty near applying the doctrine of total depravity to collective human society. But we are by no means, as Christians, shut up to the alternatives of defeatism and sentimentalism, both of which are debililating, as Professor Niebuhr shows. And while we may well share his sense of realism, it should not lead us so near to the verge of dismay or despair as this incisive thinker conducts himself, in his earnest desire not to be misled and illusioned by vain hopes.

While thus we may not accept his conception of force and enforcement or his apparently diminished estimate of the moral and spiritual power of personal and group ideals and impulsions, we are heartened by his concluding and conclusive judgment that "the ultra-rational hopes and passions of religion" alone can give us the vision of a just and righteous social order: to which should be added—and can sustain our faith in the ultimate triumph of beauty, truth and goodness, though the conflict be prolonged and severe. And as Professor Niebuhr elsewhere[27] counsels us, if humanity "should fail to appreciate any values in the religion which comes out of the agonies and mysteries of individual life, it will be chiefly because individual religion will have betrayed its social task." Such was the spirit of Jesus,[28] who was neither sentimentalist nor defeatist.

---

[26] "Moral Man and Immoral Society," by Reinhold Niebuhr. Scribner's, 1932.

[27] "The Contribution of Religion to Social Work," by Reinhold Niebuhr. Columbia Univ. Press, 1932.

FAITHFUL STEWARDSHIP

It may appear like an anti-climax to translate the functions of a united church into terms of money. Indeed, mere financial economy is but a minor consideration. Its appropriateness may be defended by the enormity of the problem, the fact that it has as yet hardly been considered seriously by the churches and finally, on the ground that money is something to be transformed into moral and spiritual values, thus involving a profound spiritual principle. The Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry, described in the previous chapter, treats this question with a directness not hitherto expressed. Funds of colossal amounts are entrusted to the churches as administrators. In business and ordinary life such has become a sacred trust, protected by severe and exacting laws with commensurate penalties. It is certainly no less a religious obligation and one not yet much more than touched upon by the church executives and boards.

As it is, the money thus entrusted is channelled denominationally in a multitude of cross-currents. Witness, for one of many obvious examples, the host of religious journals, few of which are anywhere near self-supporting, for the most part with very small subscription lists. The denominational press is thus becoming an increasingly negligible factor in church life and influence, and something more adequate than the secular journals must take its place.

And if we consider the further output of the printing press, with a largely duplicating product, the situation enlarges.

---

[28] Matthew xxv.

Pastors complain now of the multitude of documents coming to their studies from any one denomination. What would they say if each and every pastor received it all? The principle of comity also has yet a long way to go in the coöperative distribution of religious institutions, as will be discovered if we analyze any given community of reasonable size.

The churches have as yet hardly considered the problem of faithful stewardship. Even the interdenominational bodies continue to circulate independent journals to a considerable number, dealing with almost identical problems and service. The time must surely come when we shall have a religious magazine for all Christians, informing and educating them with regard to all the churches, and especially their coöperative and united service. It would require but a slight percentage of what is now expended on about fifty major denominational and interdenominational papers to support it.

Religious publicity suffers from the same cause. The possibilities inherent in a united approach are indicated in the fact that secular newspapers in large numbers, covering the whole nation, are each year printing daily the "Fellowship of Prayer." Let us suppose that they had been approached separately by the twenty-seven denominational bodies of the Federal Council with that number of fellowships of prayer. A common publicity bureau could, without much difficulty, supersede the multitude of denominational agencies flooding the press, whose releases are so often unheeded. When the representatives of these bureaus meet from time to time it is almost solely for the purpose of exchanging ideas as to how they may put across denominational publicity, while the one thing that the daily newspaper discards is what it considers propaganda.

When the radio first offered its services to the churches it began with the spreading of a common Christian message. The attitude of all these human agencies toward lending themselves to religion may be indicated by the regulations adopted at the beginning by one of the leading broadcasting agencies:

"1. This company will serve only the central or national agencies of the great religious faiths, Roman Catholic, Protestant and Jewish.

"2. The religious message should be non-sectarian and non-denominational in appeal.

"3. The religious message should be of the widest appeal, presenting the broad claims of religion, which not only aid in building up the personal and social life of the individual but also aid in popularizing religion and the church."

This is cited to indicate the attitude of "the world" when its help is sought for Christianity. Is it not wiser, in this generation, than the children of light? More recently, it is noted, with regret, that denominational agencies are seeking radio service as such, often at largely increased expense, with an appeal to groups of listeners rather than to them all. Any attempt to denominationalize the radio audience is to be deeply deplored.

These are just a few of the many examples that might be given of negligence in stewardship. When to this we add the establishment or perpetuation of competing churches and their associated social institutions the subject becomes significant, especially when we realize that it extends not only at home but in the entire foreign field. The Interchurch World Movement suffered its largest failure in the effort to secure and distribute funds on the basis of a united stewardship. Its effort in this direction was completely denominationalized.

Even when the several bodies agree to unite particular service in a common agency there is seldom any appreciable allotment of common funds, and the constituency of the churches cannot understand why a body composed of them should need to secure its support for one given matter by an appeal which duplicates that of their own denomination or board.

It is of no small significance, therefore, that a beginning has been made by the principles and spirit of stewardship promulgated by the Federal Council's Committee on Financial and Fiduciary Matters and by the association with the Federal Council of a United Stewardship Council, for in this realm "the children of this generation" have thus far shown themselves wiser than "the children of light."

The economic depression of recent years may well teach the churches some lessons. Speculation in stocks has been paralleled at times by the same impulse in denominational forward movements and their promotion. "Faith" must not be invoked to excuse speculative projects in the planting or continuing of churches in already occupied fields. Moreover, the unfortunate tendency of denominational bodies, when called upon to reduce, is to make the first cuts in their appropriations to coöperative work, whereas those should be the last. Reduced resources ought, above all, to lead to more unity, not less.

And let not the pastor or layman who assents to these principles forget to apply them to his own city or town, but rather may he ponder the recent study[29] of stewardship in local areas, as administered by the churches, which closes with these words: "In view of the literally awe-inspiring total of expenditures for church edifices in American cities, the virtually complete lack of urban investment in anything visible and material to symbolize Protestant fraternity and unity gives one pause." The requisite information for coöperative city planning is being rapidly secured and made available. Another study which has just appeared[30] involved 16 cities or sectors of cities, divided into 317 survey districts, which included about 2,000 churches. The inquiry was pursued in the light of social changes in the community, now occurring "with unprecedented rapidity." "Only one church in eight was found to be a definite and clear-cut exception to the rule of correspondence between church progress and environmental social conditions." The conclusion is, of course, that "coöperative urban strategy" is imperative. It cannot be exercised by purely local considerations. "If the experiences of church strategists in the most progressive cities and the best-staffed denominations are to be shared with those cities less fortunately equipped for the study of the strategy of city church planning, might there not be developed some national administrative agency through which local and denominational results could be cleared, in which cumulative experience could be pooled, and from which specific counsel could be sought?"

---

[29] "Protestant Coöperation in American Cities," by H. Paul Douglass. Institute of Social and Religious Research, 1930.

[30] "The Strategy of City Church Planning," by Ross Sanderson. Institute of Social and Religious Research, 1932.

It is not without significance that these conclusions with regard to home missions should appear simultaneously with the similar inquiry in the foreign mission field.

We may again consider the Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry on this subject. Whatever may be our judgment as to the methods proposed by the Commission, it does not overstate the matter when it affirms that:

> "Denominational interests, institutional pride and lack of coöperative planning have contributed to the development of conditions which should not longer be tolerated.
>
> "We are convinced that one of the most urgent needs of the missionary enterprise is the adoption and rigid enforcement, in all fields, of a definite policy of concentration of personnel and resources."

These words may be applied to almost every realm of Christian service. A genuinely faithful sense of the sacredness of stewardship would carry us far on our way to a living unity. Therefore, "Let a man so account of us, as of ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God." "Moreover it is required in stewards that a man be found faithful."[31] Observance of stewardship in material things would make for a deeper fidelity in the conservation and investment of spiritual treasures.

SOME CONCLUSIONS

Finally, let us realize that these are all questions which need not be settled before the churches can come together, whether they be problems of faith, order or service. They can be met only after the churches have come together, with faith and confidence in each other.

The way of Christian unity is so simple that the wayfaring man may not err therein. The message of the churches in its simplicity is one and the same. The messengers need but to be prepared for their task of education and evangelization; the devotional life and worship of the church is a common spiritual experience; the call from the world is clear and commanding. The first and paramount need of the hour is not larger knowledge, nor greater administrative skill, but rather a deepening humility, the new state of mind which is in Christ and, above all, the will for a unity not to be based on abstract exactitudes, but upon the Christian message, in mutual confidence and trust among those who have had a common experience of Christ and the life which is in him.

In the last sacred hours of the Master's life he gathered his disciples together. He elaborated no form of church polity which should be "traced back to the New Testament," no *corpus confessionum*[32] of truth, no exact or exacting subtleties of doctrine and order, no abstractions as to the nature of the church, no determining human nexus for apostolic succession. He gave them a sacrament, without any prescriptions as to consubstantiation or transubstantiation, which they were to observe, "in remembrance of him," and he performed an humble act of service as an example for them. Thus simple were his last living parables of the worship and service which were to be their bond of unity and the expression of their faith. He gave them the Holy Spirit.

---

[31] I Corinthians iv:1, 2.

[32] See the several volumes of doctrines under this title.

The writer is profoundly convinced that the Anglican brethren are justified in their insistence that a common participation in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is essential to any real unity among those who observe that symbol of unity. He feels that they are in error in their importunity that they must all do it in the same exact form or that they are required to hold identical rationalization of it, or indeed that they are obligated to reason on it at all. He is equally persuaded that a visible unity is not dependent upon any one formula of ordination, except by those bodies who prefer it. Neither Christian worship nor service are thus conditioned. We have artificially created and magnified differences on modes of worship and expressions of experience, whereas these are the very things on which we are most at one.

That Christian men can pray together, unite in worship and praise together, serve the world together and give to mankind one message of redemption, as the expressions of a common spiritual life in God, through Jesus Christ and his gift of the Holy Spirit, would surely seem to the world one and the same thing, as the reception of a sacrament together "in remembrance of Him."

We have in this volume outlined two main currents or movements. The one is the endeavor to set up in advance a strictly defined identity of belief and forms to which all must subscribe. It is static in nature and almost inflexible in disposition. The other is founded on confidence, faith and trust. It assumes growth by experience. It is fluid and dynamic in substance. The one tends to be mechanical; the other organic. There is a difference in their leadership. In the one case emphasis is given to forms and institutions; in the other stress is laid on the evangelistic message and on practical considerations in service. Each group of Christians needs the other, and both must find their way into a form of unity which permits diversity and liberty. It is the belief of the writer that the time is not far distant when there will be general agreement to start from where we are, to begin with the unity we already have and let our experience be prophetic in revealing the future. As to that future, no bounds need be determined. The ultimate fellowship of the Roman Catholic Church is by no means precluded.

Jesus selected only twelve unlearned disciples for the beginning of his church. Later on, when the disciples on one occasion found difficulty in administration,[33] they called together the multitude of their associates and selected "seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom" for a special task. The rest gave themselves in the meantime "to prayer and to the ministry of the word." Perhaps if we should cease our larger discussional conferences for a while, get all Christians to give themselves to prayer and ministry, selecting seven, or, if need be, seventy-seven men (and women) to go apart and spend the days and hours of their communion in worship, prayer, and the exchange of Christian experience and in solicitous consideration of a needy waiting world, its struggles and its sorrows, we might emerge from our confusion. They could make the beatitudes and the twelfth and thirteenth chapters of First Corinthians, without any need of commentaries, their daily subject of thought and conversation. They might not come back to us with the finished institutional product, but they could once more start us all on the road together.

These seven or more, however learned, however practical, must, above all be men and women of very simple personal faith in God, in Jesus Christ, in his church and in human nature. We have them, world-wide, and the writer could easily name some of them. Meanwhile, instead of further debate, let the rest of the church not fail to give themselves to constant prayer. If, let us say, from Stockholm, Lausanne, and Jerusalem, we might even have faith, as did the early disciples in the selection of Matthias,[84] and choose them by lot, provided, as in that instance, it was done with prayer, perhaps, as at Pentecost,[85] they might show us how to speak to the world our common message in such manner that "every man" could hear us speak "in his own language."

---

[33] Acts vi.

The world is drawing together politically and socially, with a deepening realization of a common destiny and consequent interdependence. Coincident with this there should be a growing sense of the need of common spiritual forces. A new social order is seeking and gradually finding its world-wide way. The need of a new Christian order of commensurate dimensions to bring spiritual forces to bear upon this new social order is apparent to every thinking man and woman. As has been said of Foreign Missions, in connection with the Laymen's Inquiry, the future of the Christian church itself depends in the largest measure upon the fulfillment of its manifest mission in union.

Truth itself, using the word in its largest and deepest terms, is not forged in the fires of discussion. Men are seldom, if ever, led to God by speculation or seeming proof in philosophy or by the discoveries of science, however helpful these may be. Religion is not a calculable thing. Faith is a human quality *sui generis*. There is such a thing as spiritual apprehension. The mutual experiences of our Christianity are found in faith, in prayer, in worship, and the discipline of the soul. There is a real other-worldliness in this world which softens this world's antagonisms and illuminates its confusing darkness. The unity of the Church of Christ is to be found in *Christian experience, worship and service.* If Christian unity is to unite souls as well as institutions, this is its path. The only or main value of institutions is in their possession of that which reaches the most inward souls of men in the appeal of the Infinite.

---

[84] Acts i.

[85] Acts ii.

Is it then a search for our common "faith"? We go back of the ecumenical councils to the faith inculcated by Jesus, which is simple trust, the giving up of one's self in penitence and submission, to the Father, through the Son, under the impulsion of the Holy Spirit. Is it an "order" for the expression of our devotional life? It is a worship "in spirit and in truth." Is it a valid ministry? "As the Father hath sent me so I send you." Is it the Sacrament? The only condition is that it be "in remembrance" of Him. Is it human service? "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." Finally, is it the gospel itself? It is the evangel of redemption through Him.

Reduced to this simplicity, if we take the three messages of Stockholm, Lausanne and Jerusalem as a preamble, the constitution of a United Church of Christ will write itself. Thus the search for "reunion" must go farther back than the ancient councils. These essentials of unity must exist in liberty of form and expression, whether intellectually in creed, whether in ceremonies to express worship or in theories as to how the divine grace has been transmitted in ministry and sacrament.

With this artlessness, every substantial condition that has been set forth, whether by Lambeth, or by the Eastern brethren, or by the followers of Martin Luther, is richly and completely met. For except we become as little children we may not enter the Kingdom of Heaven of Christian unity.

If the principles which this volume has attempted to establish and the spirit in which it is written are not persuasive, let the reader lay it aside and read again the twelfth and thirteenth chapters of First Corinthians and the words of Jesus at the Last Supper.

May it not be that the awaited revival of religion will come through the power of a united Christian church, proclaiming its universal message to mankind? Not perhaps what we generally mean by the term revival, but the awakening to a conscious realization of the sense of God, in whom we live and move and have our being; a deepening reflective perception of the life of the spirit; and through it, not a lesser, but a profounder passion to share the Kingdom of Heaven, on earth, among men; which are the mutual possessions of all followers of Christ.

There is but one form of expression in which our unity seems to have been unimpaired. It is in our hymns. This is because in them we find expression of worship, experience and service. Every conference might therefore well begin with Cardinal Newman's "Lead, Kindly Light," followed by John Greenleaf Whittier's "Dear Lord and Father of Mankind, Forgive our Feverish Ways," and close with the prayer of one [36] who, for upwards of half a century, has brought to the movement for federal unity, wisdom, sympathy, devotion and unselfish service in unmeasured amplitude:

"Where cross the crowded ways of life,
  Where sound the cries of race and clan.
Above the noise of selfish strife,
  We hear thy voice, O Son of Man.

. . . . .

"Till sons of men shall learn Thy love,
  And follow where Thy feet have trod;
Till glorious from Thy heaven above,
  Shall come the City of our God."

---

[36] Frank Mason North.—The record of personalities, lives and spiritual experiences wrought into the building of the Federal Council would make an inspiriting story.

APPENDICES

If the reader will ponder and compare these three conference messages, he will be persuaded that at least the main content of this volume is confirmed by them, namely that in those things which are fundamental, the churches are at one. How can they be more so than in their evangel which is the very heart of Christianity?

In the light of these messages to both church and world, every disagreement at Lausanne fades from our thought. Indeed, both implicitly and at points explicitly these utterances say so.

To a lesser degree, perhaps, the utterances and statements of the Lambeth Conference, the Eastern Orthodox Church and the United Lutheran Church, also open the way for federal unity.

APPENDIX I

MESSAGE OF THE INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL, JERUSALEM, 1928

The Christian Message

Go and Make Disciples of all Nations

"Throughout the world there is a sense of insecurity and instability. Ancient religions are undergoing modification, and in some regions dissolution, as scientific and commercial development alter the current of men's thought. Institutions regarded with age-long veneration are discarded or called in question; well-established standards of moral conduct are brought under criticism; and countries called Christian feel the stress as truly as the peoples of Asia and Africa. On all sides doubt is expressed whether there is any absolute truth or goodness. A new relativism struggles to enthrone itself in human thought.

"Along with this is found the existence of world-wide suffering and pain, which expresses itself partly in a despair of all higher values, partly in a tragically earnest quest of a new basis for life and thought, in the birthpangs of rising nationalism, in the ever keener consciousness of race- and class-oppression.

"Amid widespread indifference and immersion in material concerns we also find everywhere, now in noble forms and now in license or extravagance, a great yearning, especially among the youth of the world, for the full and untrammeled expression of personality, for spiritual leadership and authority, for reality in religion, for social justice, for human brotherhood, for international peace.

"In this world, bewildered and groping for its way, Jesus Christ has drawn to Himself the attention and admiration of mankind as never before. He stands before men as plainly greater than

Western civilization, greater than the Christianity that the world has come to know. Many who have not hitherto been won to His Church yet find in Him their hero and their ideal. Within His Church there is a widespread desire for unity centered in His Person.

OUR MESSAGE

"Against this background and in relation to it we have to proclaim our message.

"Our message is Jesus Christ. He is the revelation of what God is and of what man through Him may become. In Him we come face to face with the Ultimate Reality of the universe; He makes known to us God as our Father, perfect and infinite in love and in righteousness; for in Him we find God incarnate, the final, yet ever-unfolding, revelation of the God in whom we live and move and have our being.

"We hold that through all that happens, in light and darkness, God is working, ruling and over-ruling. Jesus Christ, in His life and through His death and resurrection, has disclosed to us the Father, the Supreme Reality, as almighty Love, reconciling the world to Himself by the Cross, suffering with men in their struggle against sin and evil, bearing with them and for them the burden of sin, forgiving them as they, with forgiveness in their own hearts, turn to Him in repentance and faith, and creating humanity anew for an ever-growing, ever-enlarging, everlasting life.

"The vision of God in Christ brings and deepens the sense of sin and guilt. We are not worthy of His love; we have by our own fault opposed His holy will. Yet that same vision which brings the sense of guilt brings also the assurance of pardon, if only we yield ourselves in faith to the spirit of Christ so that His redeeming love may avail to reconcile us to God.

"We reaffirm that God, as Jesus Christ has revealed Him, requires all His children, in all circumstances, at all times, and in all human relationships, to live in love and righteousness for His glory. By the resurrection of Christ and the gift of the Holy Spirit God offers His own power to men that they may be fellow workers with Him, and urges them on to a life of adventure and self-sacrifice in preparation for the coming of His Kingdom in its fulness.

"We will not ourselves offer any further formulation of the Christian message, for we remember that as lately as in August, 1927, the World Conference on Faith and Order met at Lausanne, and that a statement on this subject was issued from that Conference after it had been received with full acceptance. We are glad to make this our own.

"The message of the Church to the world is and must always remain the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

"The Gospel is the joyful message of redemption, both here and hereafter, the gift of God to sinful man in Jesus Christ.

"The world was prepared for the coming of Christ through the activities of God's Holy Spirit in all humanity, but especially in His revelation as given in the Old Testament; and in the fulness of time the eternal Word of God became incarnate and was made man, Jesus Christ, the Son of God and the Son of Man, full of grace and truth.

"Through His life and teaching, His call to repentance, His proclamation of the coming of the Kingdom of God and of judgment, His suffering and death, His resurrection and exaltation to the right hand of the Father, and by the mission of the Holy Spirit, He has brought to us forgiveness of sins, and has revealed the fulness of the living God and His boundless love toward us. By the appeal of that love, shown in its completeness on the Cross, He summons us to the new life of faith, self-sacrifice, and devotion to His service and the service of men.

"Jesus Christ, as the crucified and the living One, as Savior and Lord, is also the center of the world-wide Gospel of the Apostles and the Church. Because He Himself is the Gospel, the Gospel is the message of the Church to the world. It is more than a philosophical theory; more than a theological system; more than a program for material betterment. The Gospel is rather the gift of a new world from God to this old world of sin and death; still more, it is the victory over sin and death, the revelation of eternal life in Him who has knit together the whole family in heaven and on earth in the communion of saints, united in the fellowship of service, of prayer, and of praise.

"The Gospel is the prophetic call to sinful man to turn to God, the joyful tidings of justification and of sanctification to those who believe in Christ. It is the comfort of those who suffer; to those who are bound it is the assurance of the glorious liberty of the sons of God. The Gospel brings peace and joy to the heart, and produces in men self-denial, readiness for brotherly service, and compassionate love. It offers the supreme goal for the aspirations of youth, strength to the toiler, rest to the weary, and the crown of life to the martyr.

"The Gospel is the sure source of power for social regeneration. It proclaims the only way by which humanity can escape from those class- and race-hatreds which devastate society at present into the enjoyment of national well-being and international friendship and peace. It is also a gracious invitation to the non-Christian world, East and West, to enter into the joy of the living Lord.

"Sympathizing with the anguish of our generation, with its longing for intellectual sincerity, social justice, and spiritual inspiration, the Church in the eternal Gospel meets the needs and fulfils the God-given aspirations of the modern world. Consequently, as in the past so also in the present, the Gospel is the only way of salvation. Thus, through His Church, the living Christ still says to men, 'Come unto me! . . . He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.'

THE MISSIONARY MOTIVE

"If such is our message, the motive for its delivery should be plain. The Gospel is the answer to the world's greatest need. It is not our discovery or achievement: it rests on what we recognize as an act of God. It is first and foremost 'Good News.' It announces glorious Truth. Its very nature forbids us to say that it may be the right belief for some but not for others. Either it is true for all, or it is not true at all.

"But questions concerning the missionary motive have been widely raised, and such a change in the habits of men's thoughts as the last generation has witnessed must call for a re-examination of these questions.

"Accordingly we would lay bare the motives that impel us to the missionary enterprise. We recognize that the health of our movement and of our souls demands a self-criticism that is relentless and exacting.

"In searching for the motives that impel us we find ourselves eliminating decisively and at once certain motives that may seem, in the minds of some, to have become mixed up with purer motives in the history of the movement. We repudiate any attempt on the part of trade or of governments, openly or covertly, to use the missionary cause for ulterior purposes. Our Gospel by its very nature and by its declaration of the sacredness of human personality stands against all exploitation of man by man, so that we cannot tolerate any desire, conscious or unconscious, to use this movement for purposes of fastening a bondage, economic, political, or social, on any people.

"Going deeper, on our part we would repudiate any symptoms of a religious imperialism that would desire to impose beliefs and practices on others in order to manage their souls in their supposed interests. We obey a God who respects our wills and we desire to respect those of others.

"Nor have we the desire to bind up our Gospel with fixed ecclesiastical forms which derive their meaning from the experience of the Western church. Rather the aim should be to place at the disposal of the younger churches of all lands our collective and historical experience. We believe that much of that heritage has come out of reality and will be worth sharing. But we ardently desire that the younger churches should express the Gospel through their own genius and through forms suitable to their racial heritage. There must be no desire to lord it over the personal or collective faith of others.

"Our true and compelling motive lies in the very nature of the God to whom we have given our hearts. Since He is love, His very nature is to share. Christ is the expression in time of the eternal self-giving of the Father. Coming into fellowship with

Christ we find in ourselves an overmastering impulse to share Him with others. We are constrained by the love of Christ and by obedience to His last command. He Himself said, 'I came that they may have life, and may have it abundantly,' and our experience corroborates it. He has become life to us. We would share that life.

"We are assured that Christ comes with an offer of life to man and to societies and to nations. We believe that in Him the shackles of moral evil and guilt are broken from human personality and that men are made free, and that such personal freedom lies at the basis of the freeing of society from cramping custom and blighting social practices and political bondage, so that in Christ men and societies and nations may stand up free and complete.

"We find in Christ, and especially in His Cross and Resurrection, an inexhaustible source of power that makes us hope when there is no hope. We believe that through it men and societies and nations that have lost their moral nerve to live will be quickened into life.

"We have a pattern in our minds as to what form that life should take. We believe in a Christ-like world. We know nothing better; we can be content with nothing less. We do not go to the nations called non-Christian, because they are the worst of the world and they alone are in need; we go because they are a part of the world and share with us in the same human need—the need of redemption from ourselves and from sin, the need to have life complete and abundant and to be remade after this pattern of Christlikeness. We desire a world in which Christ will not be crucified but where His Spirit shall reign.

"We believe that men are made for Christ and cannot really live apart from Him. Our fathers were impressed with the horror that men should die without Christ—we share that horror; we are impressed also with the horror that men should live without Christ.

"Herein lies the Christian motive; it is simple. We cannot live without Christ and we cannot bear to think of men living without Him. We cannot be content to live in a world that is un-

Christ-like. We cannot be idle while the yearning of His heart for His brethren is unsatisfied.

"Since Christ is the motive, the end of Christian missions fits in with that motive. Its end is nothing less than the production of Christ-like character in individuals and societies and nations through faith in and fellowship with Christ the living Savior, and through corporate sharing of life in a divine society.

"Christ is our motive and Christ is our end. We must give nothing less, and we can give nothing more.

THE SPIRIT OF OUR ENDEAVOR

"Our approach to our task must be made in humility and penitence and love; in humility, because it is not our own message which we bring, but God's, and if in our delivery of it self-assertion finds any place we shall spoil that message and hinder its acceptance; in penitence, because our fathers and we ourselves have been so blind to many of the implications of our faith; in love, because our message is the Gospel of the Love of God, and only by love in our own hearts for those to whom we speak can we make known its power or its true nature.

"Especially do we confess the sluggishness of the older churches to realize and discharge their responsibility to carry the Gospel to all the world; and all alike we confess our neglect to bring the ordering of men's lives into conformity with the spirit of Christ. The Church has not firmly and effectively set its face against race-hatred, race-envy, race-contempt, or against social envy and contempt and class bitterness, or against racial, national, and social pride, or against the lust for wealth and exploitation of the poor or weak. We believe that the Gospel 'proclaims the only way by which humanity can escape from class- and race-hatred.' But we are forced to recognize that such a claim requires to be made good and that the record of Christendom hitherto is not sufficient to sustain it. Nor has it sufficiently sought out the good and noble elements in the non-Christian beliefs, that it might learn that deeper personal fellowship with adherents of those beliefs wherein they may be more powerfully drawn to the living Christ. We know that, even apart from conscious knowledge of

Him, when men are true to the best light they have, they are able to effect some real deliverance from many of the evils that afflict the world; and this should prompt us the more to help them to find the fulness of light and power in Christ.

"But while we record these failures we are also bound to record with thankfulness the achievements of the Christian Church in this field. The difference between the Europe known to St. Paul and the Europe known to Dante, to Luther, to Wesley is plain for all to see. From every quarter of the globe comes testimony to the liberation effected by Christ for women. Since the vast changes made by the development of industrialism have come to be appreciated, every country has had its Christian social movements and the Universal Conference on Life and Work, held at Stockholm in 1925, revealed how widespread and influential these have become. Truly our efforts have not been commensurate with the needs of the world or with the claim of Christ; but in what has been accomplished and attempted we have already great encouragement for the days to come. In particular there is a growing sensitiveness of conscience with regard to war and the conditions that may lead up to it. For all these indications of the growing power of the spirit of Christ among Christians we thank God. And we call on all Christian people to be ready for pioneering thought and action in the name of Christ. Too often the Church has adopted new truth, or new goals for enterprise, only when the danger attached to them is over. There is a risk of rashness; but there is also possible an excessive caution by which, because His Church hangs back, the glory of new truth or enterprise which rightly belongs to Christ is in men's thoughts denied to Him.

The Call to the World

"Filled with conviction that Jesus Christ is indeed the Savior of the world, and conscious of a desperate need in ourselves and in all the world for what He only can supply, we call upon our fellow Christians and all our fellow men to turn again to Him for pardon and for power.

"1. To all the churches of Christ we call; that they stand firmly upon the rock of Christian conviction and wholeheartedly accept its missionary obligations; that they go forward in full loyalty to Christ to discover and to express, in the power and freedom of the Holy Spirit, the treasures in His unsearchable riches which it is the privilege and duty of each to win for the Universal Church; that they strive to deliver the name of Christ and of Christianity from complicity in any evil or injustice.

"Those who proclaim Christ's message must give evidence for it in their own lives and in the social institutions which they uphold. It is by living Christ among men that we may most effectively lift Him up before them. The Spirit that returns love for hate, and overcomes evil with good, must be evidently present in those who would be witnesses for Christ. They are also bound to exert all their influence to secure that the social, international, and inter-racial relationships in the midst of which their work is done be subordinate to and expressive of His Spirit. Especially must it be a serious obstacle to missionary effort if a non-Christian country feels that the relation of the so-called Christian countries to itself is morally unsound or is alien from the principles of Christ, and the Church must be ready for labor and sacrifice to remove whatever is justly so condemned.

"The task before us is beyond our powers. It can be accomplished only by the Holy Spirit, whose power we receive in its completeness only in the fellowship of Christ's disciples. We call all followers of Christ to take their full share as members of His Body, which is the Church; no discontent with its organization or tradition or failings should be allowed to keep us outside its fold; the isolated Christian is impoverished in his spiritual life and impotent in his activities; our strength, both inward and outward, is in the living fellowship. But in these hurried and feverish days there is also more need than ever for the deepening of our spiritual life through periodical detachment from the world and its need in lonely communion with God. We desire also to call for a greater volume of intercessory prayer. The whole Church should be earnest and instant in prayer, each part for every other, and all together for the Church's unity and for the hallowing of God's Name throughout the world.

"Further, we call on Christians in all lands who are trained in science, art, or philosophy to devote their talents to the working out of that Christian view of life and the world which we sorely need to secure us against instability, bewilderment, and extravagance.

"Lastly, we urge that every possible step be taken to make real the fellowship of the Gospel. The churches of the West send missions and missions-of-help to the churches of Africa and Asia. We believe that the time is come when all would gain if the younger churches were invited to send missions-of-help to the churches of Europe and America, that they may minister of their treasure to the spiritual life of those to whom they come.

"2. To non-Christians also we make our call. We rejoice to think that just because in Jesus Christ the light that lighteth every man shone forth in its full splendor, we find rays of that same light where He is unknown or even is rejected. We welcome every noble quality in non-Christian persons or systems as further proof that the Father, who sent His Son into the world, has nowhere left Himself without witness.

"Thus, merely to give illustration, and making no attempt to estimate the spiritual value of other religions to their adherents, we recognize as part of the one Truth that sense of the Majesty of God and the consequent reverence in worship which are conspicuous in Islam; the deep sympathy for the world's sorrow and unselfish search for the way of escape, which are at the heart of Buddhism; the desire for contact with Ultimate Reality conceived as spiritual, which is prominent in Hinduism; the belief in a moral order of the universe and consequent insistence on moral conduct, which are inculcated by Confucianism; the disinterested pursuit of truth and of human welfare which are often found in those who stand for secular civilization but do not accept Christ as their Lord and Savior.

"Especially we make our call to the Jewish people, whose Scriptures have become our own, and 'of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh,' that with open heart they turn to that Lord in whom is fulfilled the hope of their nation, its prophetic message, and its zeal for holiness. And we call upon our fellow

Christians in all lands to show to Jews that loving kindness that has too seldom been shown toward them.

"We call on the followers of non-Christian religions to join with us in the study of Jesus Christ as He stands before us in the Scriptures. His place in the life of the world, and His power to satisfy the human heart; to hold fast to faith in the unseen and eternal in face of the growing materialism of the world; to co-operate with us against all the evils of secularism; to respect freedom of conscience so that men may confess Christ without separation from home and friends; and to discern that all the good of which men have conceived is fulfilled and secured in Christ.

"Christianity is not a western religion, nor is it yet effectively accepted by the western world as a whole. Christ belongs to the peoples of Africa and Asia as much as to the European or American. We call all men to equal fellowship in Him. But to come to Him is always self-surrender. We must not come in the pride of national heritage or religious tradition; he who would enter the Kingdom of God must become as a little child, though in that Kingdom are all the treasures of man's aspirations, consecrated and harmonized. Just because Christ is the self-disclosure of the One God, all human aspirations are towards Him, and yet of no human tradition is He merely the continuation. He is the desire of all nations; but He is always more, and other, than they had desired before they learned of Him.

"But we would insist that when the Gospel of the Love of God comes home with power to the human heart, it speaks to each man, not as Muslim or as Buddhist, or as an adherent of any system, but just as man. And while we rightly study other religions in order to approach men wisely, yet at the last we speak as men to men, inviting them to share with us the pardon and the life that we have found in Christ.

"3. To all who inherit the benefits of secular civilization and contribute to its advancement we make our call. We claim for Christ the labors of scientists and artists. We recognize their service to His cause in dispersing the darkness of ignorance, superstition, and vulgarity. We appreciate also the noble elements that are found in nationalist movements and in patriotism, the loyalty, the self-devotion, the idealism, which love of country can inspire. But even these may lead to strife and bitterness and narrowness of outlook if they are not dedicated to Christ; in His universal Kingdom of Love all nations by right are provinces, and fulfil their own true destiny only in His service. When patriotism and science are not consecrated they are often debased into self-assertion, exploitation, and the service of greed. Indeed, throughout all nations, the great peril of our time arises from that immense development of man's power over the resources of nature which has been the great characteristic of our epoch. This power gives opportunity for wealth of interest, and, through facilities of communication, for freedom of intercourse such as has never been known. But it has outgrown our spiritual and moral control.

"Amid the clashes of industrial strife the Gospel summons men to work together as brothers in providing for the human family the economic basis of the good life. In the presence of social antipathies and exclusiveness the Gospel insists that we are members of one family, and that our Father desires for each a full and equal opportunity to attain to His own complete development, and to make his special contribution to the richness of the family life. Confronted by international relations that constantly flout Christ's law of love, there is laid on all who bear His name the solemn obligation to labor unceasingly for a new world-order in which justice shall be secured for all peoples, and every occasion for war or threat of war be removed.

"Such changes can be brought about only through an unreserved acceptance of Christ's way of love, and by the courageous and sacrificial living that it demands. Still ringing in our ears is the call, 'Be not fashioned according to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind.'

Conclusion

"In our conference together we have seen more clearly the fulness and sufficiency of the Gospel and our own need of the salvation of Christ. The enlarging thoughts of the generation find the Gospel and the Savior ever richer and greater than men had known.

"This deepened assurance of the adequacy and universality of the Gospel, however, is not enough. More effective ways must be found for its proclamation, not to systems of opinion only, but to human beings, to men and women for whom Christ died. The most thorough and convincing intellectual statement of Christianity is necessary, but such statements cannot suffice. The Gospel must be expressed also in simplicity and love, and offered to men's hearts and minds by word and deed and life, by righteousness and loving-kindness, by justice, sympathy, and compassion, by ministry to human needs and to the deep want of the world.

"As together, Christians of all lands, we have surveyed the world and the needs of men, we are convinced of the urgent necessity for a great increase in the Christian forces in all countries, and for a still fuller measure of coöperation between the churches of all nations in more speedily laying the claim of Christ upon all the unoccupied areas of the world and of human life.

"We are persuaded that we and all Christian people must seek a more heroic practice of the Gospel. It cannot be that our present complacency and moderation are a faithful expression of the mind of Christ, and of the meaning of His Cross and Resurrection in the midst of the wrong and want and sin of our modern world. As we contemplate the work with which Christ has charged His Church, we who are met here on the Mount of Olives, in sight of Calvary, would take up for ourselves and summon those from whom we come and to whom we return to take up with us the Cross of Christ, and all that for which it stands, and to go forth into the world to live in the fellowship of His sufferings and by the power of His resurrection, in hope and expectation of His glorious Kingdom."

APPENDIX II

CONSTITUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL

The present status of federal unity was largely revealed at Jerusalem in a statement on

The Future Organization of the International Missionary Council

"1. The missionary enterprise is in all lands actually and manifestly international.

"2. It is necessary to reveal the awareness on the part of the missionary movement of the international consciousness which pervades all departments of human progress.

"3. There are many world situations involving missions with which it is impossible to deal except internationally.

"4. A Christian missionary international organization is needed to represent missions in relations with other representative international bodies.

"5. The essential spiritual unity already existing among Christians demands manifestation in international missionary cooperation.

Revised Constitution of the International Missionary Council

I. PREAMBLE

"The Council is established on the basis that the only bodies entitled to determine missionary policy are the churches and the missionary societies and boards, representing the churches.

"It is recognized that the successful working of the International Missionary Council is entirely dependent on the gift from God of the spirit of fellowship, mutual understanding, and desire to cooperate.

. . . .

III. FUNCTIONS

The functions of the Council shall be the following:

"1. To stimulate thinking and investigation on questions related to the mission and expansion of Christianity in all the world, to enlist in the solution of these questions the best knowledge and experience to be found in all countries, and to make the results available for all who share in the missionary work of the churches.

"2. To help to coordinate the activities of the national missionary organizations and Christian councils of the different countries, and to bring about united action where necessary in missionary matters.

"3. Through common consultation to help to unite Christian public opinion in support of freedom of conscience and religion and of missionary liberty.

"4. To help to unite the Christian forces of the world in seeking justice in international and inter-racial relations.

. . . .

The area of federal unity in Foreign Missions was set forth in a statement on

THE FUNCTIONS AND SCOPE OF COOPERATION

"The International Missionary Council, having surveyed the field of cooperation as it affects the working of national Christian councils in the light of eighteen years' experience since the World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh in 1910, reaffirms its conviction that these organizations offer to the Christian forces both in the East and in the West a unique opportunity for concerted and united action, which, when rightly understood, creates a new Christian unity, a corporate life, and a solidarity of aim and purpose among all who are working for the extension of the Kingdom of God.

. . . .

"The spiritual implications of the Gospel demand unity among those who are seeking to spread the Good News, and we note with thankfulness to God the Divine guidance given in the past eighteen years to Christians of many races and denominations in their search for an immediate, if perhaps only a temporary, way out of the difficulties of disunion and separation. We note, too, the fact that the measure of unity attained among different churches and missions has not meant any colorless and nebulous position, in which differences and convictions have been hidden away, but rather the contribution of each section of the Church to the good of the whole. The basis of cooperation has been a frank recognition of differences by an honest search for unity in and through the Holy Spirit, which transcends the divisive elements in present-day Christianity. Christian cooperation has therefore found its basis in the life and teaching of Jesus Christ. Its inspiration has been no cut-and-dried organization, but the spirit of Jesus, and unity has been attained through the united service in a common task for the evangelization of the world.

"We note that misunderstanding has at times arisen through the fear that national Christian councils were a plan for church federation. The constitutions of the councils presented to this meeting of the International Missionary Council show that these bodies do not seek to make federation their objective, but rather to recognize the different church organizations and by drawing together widely separated groups of Christians to unite them in that spiritual fellowship which must be a necessary condition for any organic union that the future may hold for the churches.

"It is our opinion that cooperation is not merely advisable or good, but that it is a vital necessity today. The world is now organized internationally. Races and nations are interdependent, and the outward unification of the world makes supremely important the spiritual unity of the Church. Christianity has thus been brought into an international environment, and through it the Christian forces are beginning to discover the true international character of the Christian Mission. The world situation is making increasing demands upon the Church, and there is an insistent call for better-thought-out and better-directed policies among Christian missions. The national Christian councils are not only a notable response to this demand, but in many cases the only means of attaining it.

"Many types of cooperation have already been tested through the national Christian councils. The experience already gained shows that through this cooperative agency work is better done than formerly when each church or mission acted alone. Money is saved by joint effort, and tasks that were beyond the capacities of any one body are now efficiently undertaken by the united forces of the Church. The fact that Christians situated in a non-Christian land can now speak with one voice on great moral and social questions should, we think, be sufficient to commend this work to the whole Christian Church. Surveys of mission areas have been made, the forces at work appraised and attention called to the unoccupied fields. Overlapping has been avoided, and out of this fellowship there has come a new efficiency in work in many areas.

"The production and circulation of Christian literature is an outstanding example of the value of cooperation. A common policy for literature has given a greater variety and a higher standard in the books produced. Reference should also be made to cooperation in education. Schools and colleges that were inadequately staffed or financed have been, by cooperation, lifted up to a new level of efficiency. The preparation and training of missionaries, once so neglected, has entered upon a new day through the language schools and kindred institutions carried on cooperatively. In this connection we would cite the School of Oriental Studies in Cairo.

"National Christian councils have been foremost in planning retreats and conferences, in organizing united evangelistic campaigns, and in deepening spiritual fellowship among Christians of different races and sects. The headquarters of national Christian councils, such as those in India, China, and Brazil, have provided for all missionaries central bureaus of information. They have proved themselves to be a base for progressive research and a clearing-house for new ideas. These councils glory in the fact that through them the Church has often been able to express a common Christian witness to a non-Christian people. Perhaps the most outstanding contribution of cooperation to the progress of the Gospel has been the help thus given to the indigenous churches. The place of the missionary within the indigenous church is better understood since missionaries and nationals have joined together upon a basis of equality for their common task.

Principles and Recommendations

"Having surveyed the scope and value of cooperation upon national lines, we wish to place on record some of the governing principles that have made for successful cooperation:

"1. The organization of a national Christian council should not be regarded as the setting up of another mission with independent authority apart from those cooperating. The best national Christian councils have emphasized the fact that the powers they possess are only such powers as the cooperating bodies confer upon them, and that apart from units which compose them, the national Christian councils have no existence.

"2. National Christian councils should act on behalf of the cooperating bodies in all matters of common interest when they are satisfied that the action taken will be in accordance with the wishes of these bodies. A national Christian council, however, should be free to respond to any request for service on the part of any considerable portion of its constituency. But it should be made clear that the rendering of any special service at the request of a section of the national Christian council would not necessarily imply on the part of the national Christian council the unanimous endorsement of the services rendered.

. . . .

"4. The national Christian council should be fully national in the sense of serving the nation, employing the methods and preserving the spirit of the indigenous Christian body, and calling forth indigenous Christian leadership. The missionaries and the indigenous church leaders, however, should endeavor to maintain the international and interdenominational character of the membership of each national Christian council so as to embrace, in every cooperative effort, the richness of the contribution coming from the several nations and communions.

"5. All duplication of effort should be avoided. There is a real danger in over-organization and in a multiplication of committees. The machinery of a national Christian council should be reduced to a minimum. Where opportunity offers, the national Christian council may well take the initiative in starting an enterprise; and when it has become established it may either transfer it to another organization, or give it full autonomy.

"6. National Christian councils will be judged not so much by the efficiency of the machine as by the spiritual fellowship they create. They can be regarded as worth the time and expense they cost to busy workers only where they generate life and lead to a deepening of spiritual experience shared by all who cooperate.

"7. An essential to success is adequate financial support, if the great principles involved in cooperation are to be made effective in the life of the nations. The churches and boards should place the demands of this work, in both men and money, in the very forefront of their program. Cooperation is worth doing, as experience shows; and it is worth doing supremely well.

"8. National Christian councils should, at an early date, seek direct affiliation with the International Missionary Council. The advantages of this have been abundantly proved by the experience of the national Christian councils that are now in affiliation. . . .

"9. The attention of the national Christian councils is called to the advantage of each council's establishing contacts with councils in other areas in order to facilitate the free exchange of experience and thought.

. . . .

Conclusion

"The supreme hope of effective cooperation lies in Christ who is the source of all creative and enduring work. The resources of God are at our disposal, and the limitless power of God can be made available for the great unfinished task, but there is nothing in the New Testament to show that these resources are ever cheaply available. There is a price to be paid and we are convinced that part of this price is the uniting of the divided forces of our faith, the creating of a fellowship in which prayer is a reality, and the realization of that unity which always follows every new manifestation of the Spirit's life and power in the Church. St. Paul faced in the young churches a situation which had many elements common to our problem today. The lack of concerted effort, the want of love and spiritual solidarity were marks of the Corinthian Church. The solution was and is the same. The divided brethren were summoned to love one another, and to serve one another. 'No man liveth unto himself' is a truth that applies with equal force to a mission field as to an individual. We are called today to a new discovery of spiritual unity, faith, and power that we may prove our message to be adequate to a world need. It is our conviction that this is impossible apart from that cooperation which is demanded by the Living Christ who indwells His Church. Only as we come back to the place called Calvary can we see the hindrances of our divisions and the failures of our Christian expression throughout the world. Only in penitence for the past and in a new sense of our oneness in Christ can we go forward in the task of the days to come."

Like the Constitution of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, all that is needed is the fulfillment of these provisions to bring the unity we pray for to its gradual completion.

APPENDIX III

MESSAGE OF THE UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE ON LIFE AND WORK, STOCKHOLM, 1925

"1. The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, assembled at Stockholm from August 19 to 30, 1925, and composed of representatives of the greater number of Christian communions coming from thirty-seven nations of the Old and New Worlds, and of the Near and Far East, sends this brotherly message to all followers of Christ, beseeching them to join with them in prayer, confession, thanksgiving, study, and service. We regret that not all Christian communions have found it possible to accept our invitation, for in view of the vital and far-reaching issues with which we have been concerned, we cannot but hope for that cooperation of all parts of the Church of Christ without which its testimony and influence in the world must be incomplete.

"2. For five years men and women have planned and prayed that this Conference might be held. Other efforts for closer relations between the Churches have prepared the way. But this has proved the most signal instance of fellowship and cooperation, across the boundaries of nations and confessions, which the world has yet seen. The sins and sorrows, the struggles and losses of the Great War and since have compelled the Christian Churches to recognize, humbly and with shame, that 'the world is too strong for a divided Church'. Leaving for the time our differences in Faith and Order, our aim has been to secure united practical action in Christian Life and Work. The Conference itself is a conspicuous fact. But it is only a beginning.

"3. We confess before God and the world the sins and failures of which the Churches have been guilty, through lack of love and sympathetic understanding. Loyal seekers after truth and righteousness have been kept away from Christ, because His followers have so imperfectly represented Him to mankind. The call of the present hour to the Church should be repentance, and with repentance a new courage springing from the inexhaustible resources which are in Christ.

"4. It is a matter for deep thankfulness that in the plan of God and through the guidance of His Spirit the representatives of so many Christian communions have been led to assemble and have renewed in common fellowship their faith, hope, and love in Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord. It is a matter for deep thankfulness that in spite of differences, sincere and profound, they have been enabled to discuss so many difficult problems with a candor, a charity, and a self-restraint which the Spirit of God alone could inspire. As we repeated the Lord's Prayer together, each in the speech his mother taught him, we realized afresh our common faith, and experienced as never before the unity of the Church of Christ.

II

"5. The Conference has deepened and purified our devotion to the Captain of our Salvation. Responding to His call, 'Follow Me', we have in the presence of the Cross accepted the urgent duty of applying His Gospel in all realms of human life—industrial, social, political, and international.

"6. Thus in the sphere of economics we have declared that the soul is the supreme value, that it must not be subordinated to the rights of property or to the mechanism of industry, and that it may claim as its first right the right of salvation. Therefore we contend for the free and full development of the human personality. In the name of the Gospel we have affirmed that industry should not be based solely on the desire for individual profit, but that it should be conducted for the service of the community. Property should be regarded as a stewardship for which an account must be given to God. Cooperation between capital and labor should take the place of conflict, so that employers and employed alike may be enabled to regard their part in industry as the fulfilment of a vocation. Thus alone can we obey our Lord's command, to do unto others even as we would they should do unto us.

"7. In the realm of social morality we considered the problems presented by overcrowding, unemployment, laxity of morals, drink and its evils, crime and the criminal. Here we were led to recognize that these problems are so grave that they cannot be solved by individual effort alone, but that the community must accept responsibility for them, and must exercise such social control over individual action as in each instance may be necessary for the common good. We have not neglected the more intimate questions which a higher appreciation of personality raises in the domain of education, the family and the vocation, questions which affect woman, the child, and the worker. The Church must contend not for the rights of the individual as such, but for the rights of the moral personality, since all mankind is enriched by the full unfolding of even a single soul.

"8. We have also set forth the guiding principles of a Christian internationalism, equally opposed to a national bigotry and a weak cosmopolitanism. We have affirmed the universal character of the Church, and its duty to preach and practise the love of the brethren. We have considered the relation of the individual conscience to the state. We have examined the race problem, the subject of law and arbitration, and the constitution of an international order which would provide peaceable methods for removing the causes of war—questions which in the tragic conditions of today make so deep an appeal to our hearts. We summon the Churches to share with us our sense of the horror of war, and of its futility as a means of settling international disputes, and to pray and work for the fulfilment of the promise that under the sceptre of the Prince of Peace, 'mercy and truth shall meet together, righteousness and peace shall kiss each other.'

"9. We have not attempted to offer precise solutions, nor have we confirmed by a vote the results of our friendly discussions. This was due not only to our respect for the convictions of individuals or groups, but still more to the feeling that the mission of the Church is above all to state principles, and to assert the ideal, while leaving to individual consciences and to communities the duty of applying them with charity, wisdom, and courage.

III

"10. If this goal is to be attained we recognize the pressing need of education. The individual must be educated by the Church, so that he may be enabled to exercise a Christian discernment in all things. The Churches must educate themselves by study, conference, and prayer, so that being led by the Spirit of Truth into all truth, they may be enabled in increasing measure to apprehend the mind of Christ. We recognize that the root of evil is to be found in the human will, and we therefore desire to reemphasize our conviction that this will must be surrendered to the high and holy will of God, whose service is perfect freedom. Even Christian ideas and ideals cannot save the world if separated from their personal source in the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and unless themselves taken up into the personal life of the believer.

"11. To this end we address our appeal first to all Christians. Let each man, following his own conscience, and putting his convictions to the test of practical life, accept his full personal responsibility for the doing of God's Will on earth as it is in heaven, and in working for God's Kingdom. Let him in entire loyalty to his own Church seek to have a share in that wider fellowship and cooperation of the Christian Churches of which this Conference is a promise and pledge. In the name of this wider fellowship we would send a special message of sympathy to all those who amid circumstances of persecution and trial are fulfilling their Christian calling, and we would comfort them with the thought that they are thus brought into fellowship with the sufferings of Christ.

"12. But we cannot confine this appeal to the Churches, for we gratefully recognize that now we have many allies in this holy cause.

"We turn to the young of all countries. With keen appreciation we have heard of their aspirations and efforts for a better social order as expressed in the youth movements of many lands. We desire to enlist the ardor and energy of youth, the freshness and the fullness of their life, in the service of the Kingdom of God and of humanity.

"We think also of those who are seeking after truth, by whatever way, and ask their help. As Christ is the Truth, so Christ's Church heartily welcomes every advance of reason and conscience among men. Particularly we would invite the cooperation of those teachers and scholars who in many realms possess the influence and command the knowledge without which the solution of our pressing practical problems is impossible.

"In the name of the Son of Man, the Carpenter of Nazareth, we send this message to the workers of the world. We thankfully record the fact that at present even under difficult conditions a multitude of workers in the different countries are acting in accordance with these principles. We deplore the causes of misunderstanding and estrangement which still exist and are determined to do our part to remove them. We share their aspirations after a just and fraternal social order, through which the opportunity shall be assured for the development, according to God's design, of the full manhood of every man.

"13. We have said that this Conference is only a beginning. We cannot part without making some provision for the carrying on of our work. We have therefore decided to form a Continuation Committee to follow up what has been begun, to consider how effect can be given to the suggestions which have been made, to examine the practicability of calling another such Conference at a future date, and in particular to take steps for that further study of difficult problems and that further education of ourselves and of our churches, on which all wise judgment and action must be based. May we not hope that through the work of this body, and through the increasing fellowship and cooperation of the Christians of all nations in the one Spirit, our oneness in Christ may be more and more revealed to the world in Life and Work?

"14. Only as we become inwardly one shall we attain real unity of mind and spirit. The nearer we draw to the Crucified, the nearer we come to one another, in however varied colors the Light of the World may be reflected in our faith. Under the

Cross of Jesus Christ we reach out hands to one another. The Good Shepherd had to die in order that he might gather together the scattered children of God. In the Crucified and Risen Lord alone lies the world's hope.

"Now unto Him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto Him be glory in the Church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end. Amen."

APPENDIX IV

MESSAGES OF THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER, LAUSANNE, 1927

Preamble

Unanimously adopted by the Full Conference, August 20, 1927

"We, representatives of many Christian Communions throughout the world, united in the common confession of faith in Jesus Christ the Son of God, our Lord and Savior, believing that the Spirit of God is with us, are assembled to consider the things wherein we agree and the things wherein we differ.

. . . .

"This is a Conference summoned to consider matters of Faith and Order. It is emphatically *not* attempting to define the conditions of future reunion. Its object is to register the apparent level of fundamental agreements within the Conference and the grave points of disagreements remaining; also to suggest certain lines of thought which may in the future tend to a fuller measure of agreement.

". . . We thank God and rejoice over agreements reached; upon our agreements we build. Where the reports record differences, we call upon the Christian world to an earnest reconsideration of the conflicting opinions now held, and a strenuous endeavor to reach the truth as it is in God's mind, which should be the foundation of the Church's unity.

"The Call to Unity

"Unanimously adopted by the Full Conference, August 20, 1927

"God wills unity. Our presence in this Conference bears testimony to our desire to bend our wills to His. However we may justify the beginnings of disunion, we lament its continuance and henceforth must labor, in penitence and faith, to build up our broken walls.

"God's Spirit has been in the midst of us. It was He who called us hither. His presence has been manifest in our worship, our deliberations and our whole fellowship. He has discovered us to one another. He has enlarged our horizons, quickened our understanding, and enlivened our hope. We have dared and God has justified our daring. We can never be the same again. Our deep thankfulness must find expression in sustained endeavor to share the visions vouchsafed us here with those smaller home groups where our lot is cast.

"More than half the world is waiting for the Gospel. At home and abroad sad multitudes are turning away in bewilderment from the Church because of its corporate feebleness. Our missions count that as a necessity which we are inclined to look on as a luxury. Already the mission field is impatiently revolting from the divisions of the Western Church to make bold adventure for unity in its own right. We of the Churches represented in this Conference cannot allow our spiritual children to outpace us. We with them must gird ourselves to the task, the early beginnings of which God has so richly blessed, and labor side by side until our common goal is reached.

"Some of us, pioneers in this undertaking, have grown old in our search for unity. It is to youth that we look to lift the torch on high. We men have carried it too much alone through many years. The women henceforth should be accorded their share of responsibility. And so the whole Church will be enabled to do that which no section can hope to perform.

"It was God's clear call that gathered us. With faith stimulated by His guidance to us here, we move forward.

THE CHURCH'S MESSAGE TO THE WORLD—THE GOSPEL

Received by the full Conference, nem. con., August 19, 1927

"The message of the Church to the world is and must always remain the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

"The Gospel is the joyful message of redemption, both here and hereafter, the gift of God to sinful man in Jesus Christ.

"The world was prepared for the coming of Christ through the activities of God's Spirit in all humanity, but especially in His revelation as given in the Old Testament; and in the fullness of time the eternal Word of God became incarnate, and was made man, Jesus Christ, the son of God and the son of Man, full of grace and truth.

"Through His life and teaching, His call to repentance, His proclamation of the coming of the Kingdom of God and of judgment, His suffering and death, His resurrection and exaltation to the right hand of the Father, and by the mission of the Holy Spirit, He has brought to us forgiveness of sins, and has revealed the fullness of the living God, and His boundless love toward us. By the appeal of that love, shown in its completeness on the Cross, He summons us to the new life of faith, self-sacrifice, and devotion to His service and the service of men.

"Jesus Christ, as the crucified and the living One, as Savior and Lord, is also the centre of the world-wide Gospel of the Apostles and the Church. Because He Himself is the Gospel, the Gospel is the message of the Church to the world. It is more than a philosophical theory; more than a theological system; more than a programme for material betterment. The Gospel is rather the gift of a new world from God to this old world of sin and death; still more, it is the victory over sin and death, the revelation of eternal life in Him who has knit together the whole family in heaven and on earth in the communion of saints, united in the fellowship of service, of prayer, and of praise.

"The Gospel is the prophetic call to sinful man to turn to God, the joyful tidings of justification and of sanctification to those who believe in Christ. It is the comfort of those who suffer; to those who are bound, it is the assurance of the glorious liberty of the sons of God. The Gospel brings peace and joy to the heart, and produces in men self-denial, readiness for brotherly service, and compassionate love. It offers the supreme goal for the aspirations of youth, strength to the toiler, rest to the weary, and the crown of life to the martyr.

"The Gospel is the sure source of power for social regeneration. It proclaims the only way by which humanity can escape from those class and race hatreds which devastate society at present into the enjoyment of national well-being and international friendship and peace. It is also a gracious invitation to the non-Christian world, East and West, to enter into the joy of the living Lord.

"Sympathizing with the anguish of our generation, with its longing for intellectual sincerity, social justice, and spiritual inspiration, the Church in the Eternal Gospel meets the needs and fulfils the God-given aspirations of the modern world. Consequently, as in the past, so also in the present, the Gospel is the only way of salvation. Thus, through His Church, the living Christ still says to men, 'Come unto me! . . . He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life'."

Let the reader recall that here we have three messages from as many separate gatherings, each with its own special objective, and that the resulting epistles are identical in spirit and substance.

APPENDIX V

STATEMENT OF THE UNITED LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA, 1920

"WHEREAS, during the past two years the Executive Board has been asked repeatedly to define the attitude of the United Lutheran Church in America toward cooperative movements, both within and without the Lutheran Church, toward movements of various kinds looking in the direction of Church union, and toward organizations, tendencies and movements, some of them within and some of them without the organized Church; and

"Whereas, The Constitution of The United Lutheran Church in America and its By-Laws require that the forming and dissolving of 'relations with other bodies, organizations and movements' lies within the power of the United Lutheran Church alone and that 'all questions affecting the principles, practice and policy of the Church as a whole' shall be referred to the Church for decision: therefore

"The Executive Board submits to the United Lutheran Church the following Declaration of Principles Concerning the Church and its External Relationships and recommends it for adoption.

"In order that all misunderstandings and misconstructions of this Declaration, or of any of its parts, may be avoided, the United Lutheran Church in America declares in advance that it does not regard the statements therein contained as altering or amending the Confessions of the Church in any particular, or as changing the doctrinal basis of the United Lutheran Church, set forth in Article II of the Constitution. On the contrary, it considers this Declaration nothing more than the application to present conditions of doctrines already contained in the Confessions.

A. CONCERNING THE CATHOLIC SPIRIT IN THE CHURCH

"I. In its Confessions the Evangelical Lutheran Church declares its belief that there is 'one holy Church', which 'will continue forever'. It defines this Church as the 'congregation of saints and true believers'. (Augs. Conf., VII and VIII.)

"II. This one holy Church performs its earthly functions and makes its presence known among men through groups of men who profess to be believers in Jesus Christ. In these groups the Word of God is preached and the Sacraments are administered. To such groups also the name 'church' is given in the New Testament and in the Confessions of our Church.

"III. The existence of the one, holy Church is not capable of demonstration. It is a 'mystery' that can be apprehended only by faith. To the eyes of men it appears that there is not one Church, but only many churches; nevertheless we believe that there is but one Church of Jesus Christ. This conviction rests upon our belief in the continued life of Christ in all His Christians, binding them together into one spiritual Temple, of which He is the Cornerstone; and upon our belief in the efficacy of the Word of God and the Sacraments as Means of Grace. (A.C., V.) We believe that wherever the Word of God is preached and the Sacraments are administered, the Holy Spirit works faith in Christ. In every such place, therefore, there are believers in Jesus Christ, and wherever there are believers, there the one holy Church is present. For this reason we call the Word and the Sacraments 'marks' or 'signs' of the one holy Church. Therefore the Augsburg Confession adds to its definition of the Church words, 'in which the Gospel is rightly taught and the Sacraments are rightly administered.'

"IV. In the Nicene Creed we confess our belief that this Church is 'one, holy, catholic and apostolic'.

"1. We believe that this Church is one, because we believe that there cannot be more than one 'congregation of saints and true believers', or more than one spiritual Body of which Christ is the Head, or more than one spiritual Temple of which He is the Cornerstone.

"2. We believe that this Church is holy, because we believe that to all believers the righteousness of Christ is given, with the forgiveness of their sins, for which reason true believers are called 'saints' in the New Testament and in the Confessions of our

Church. Moreover, the Holy Spirit, through the Word and the Sacraments preached and administered in the churches, does progressively create holiness of life and will and purpose in all those who believe, and progressively unites their lives with the continued life of Christ.

"3. We believe that this one holy Church is catholic, because we believe that, since there is but one 'congregation of saints and true believers', it must include all the saints and true believers, of every time and place (Apol. Chap. IV). By the term 'catholic', therefore, we describe that quality of universality which belongs to the Church as a spiritual reality, or object of faith (Cf. III, above), and raises it above all local and temporal forms of expression in organization, rite and ceremony.

"4. We believe that this one, holy, catholic Church is also apostolic, not because of the union of its members in any one organization which claims to possess external, historical connection with the Apostles, but because we believe that the faith in Jesus Christ, which all the members of the one, holy catholic Church have in common, is the same faith that was in the hearts and lives of the Apostles of Jesus Christ; and because we believe that this faith has been and still is perpetuated by the unbroken testimony of believers, through all the centuries of Christian history, from the days of the Apostles to the present day; and because we believe that in the Holy Scriptures we have a permanent and authoritative record of that apostolic truth which is the ground of Christian faith.

"V. Every group of professing Christians calling itself a Church will seek to express in its own life the attributes of the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church. This it does:

"1. By professing faith in Jesus Christ. Faith in Christ, as the Saviour of the world and the Revealer of the will and love of God the Father, is necessary to the existence of the Church. Therefore no group of men, however organized, which does not exist as a congregation of professed believers in Jesus Christ can claim the name of Church; for it is Christ Himself, living, by the Holy Spirit, in the believing Christians, Who makes the Church one and holy.

"2. By preaching the Word and administering the Sacraments. Every group calling itself a Church must preach the Word and administer the Sacraments, for these are the means through which the Holy Spirit works faith, and thus creates and perpetuates the one holy Church. Therefore the Word and the Sacraments are properly called 'marks' of the Church (Cf. III, above), for where they are present the Church is; where they are absent the Church is not and cannot be.

"In the preaching of the word and the administration of the Sacraments every group of Christians seeks to express the apostolic character of the one holy Church. Every such group bases its preaching and teaching upon the Scriptures, and endeavors to proclaim what it has learned from them. Believing that it has correctly ascertained this truth, it becomes its duty to teach, preach and confess it fully, freely and courageously. Christians must not only profess their faith in Christ, but must also confess and publicly declare what they believe about Christ and His Gospel; this duty of every Christian is the imperative duty of every group of Christians calling itself a Church.

"3. By works of serving love. The ideals of love and service which Christ has taught as the true ideals of the individual Christian life, must also be the ideals of any group calling itself a Church. The love of Christians for God and His Christ, for one another and their fellowmen, is a motive strong enough to drive them to works of practical service, and this love, itself a creation of God the Holy Spirit within the hearts of men, sets tasks for every group that calls itself a Church. They are tasks of service, not of government, of love, not of law (Cf. D. IV. 3, below). These works of love and service are a witness to the faith that lives in the whole group and an evidence of the presence of the living Christ, and are in themselves a proclamation of the Gospel. In outward form they may appear to be merely humanitarian and altruistic; in motive they are Christian, born of the love of Christ, and performed in His name and in obedience to His command.

"4. By the attempt to secure universal acceptance of the truth which it holds and confesses. Such an attempt need not be accompanied by the effort to enlarge its own external organization by drawing into its membership Christians of other organizations, for the aim of a Church should be not to make proselytes, but to spread the truth of the Gospel. To this end it will constantly bear witness to the truth which it believes, and by this testimony, and by the cultivation of sympathy with all those who hold the same truth, every group will seek to attain universality, and thus express completely the holy Church's attribute to catholicity.

"5. To accomplish these purposes (Nos. 1-4 above) every such group will maintain the office of the ministry, commanded and instituted by Christ. For the sake of good order and efficiency, further organization is also necessary, but the forms which the organization takes will vary with circumstances of time and place, and are, in themselves, matters of expediency.

"VI. Every group of professing Christians in which the Word of God is so preached and the Sacraments are so administered that men are saved therein is truly, partial and imperfect as it may be, an expression of the one holy Church (Cf. II, above), inasmuch as it displays the marks of the Church (Cf. III and V, 2 above). Therefore no one group can rightfully claim that it is the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church in the sense in which these terms have been defined above (No. IV).

"We believe, however, that distinctions must be recognized between one group and another. In making these distinctions, we believe that those groups in which the Word of God is most purely preached and confessed, according to the Holy Scriptures, and in which the Sacraments are administered in the closest conformity to the institution of Christ, will be the most complete expression of the one, holy Church. For this reason it is necessary that, when occasion arises, any such group of Christians shall define its relationship to other groups which also claim the name of Church, as well as to other groups and organizations which do not bear that name.

"VII. This definition of relationships should be framed in the spirit of catholicity. Moved by that spirit, a Church will always be ready:

"1. To declare unequivocally what it believes concerning Christ and His Gospel, and to endeavor to show that it has placed the true interpretation upon that Gospel (Cf. V, 2 and 4, above), and to testify definitely and frankly against error.

"2. To approach others without hostility, jealousy, suspicion or pride, in the sincere and humble desire to give and receive Christian service.

"3. To grant cordial recognition to all agreements which are discovered between its own interpretation of the Gospel and that which others hold.

"4. To cooperate with other Christians in works of serving love (Cf. V, 3, above) insofar as this can be done without surrender of its interpretation of the Gospel, without denial of conviction, and without suppression of its testimony as to what it holds to be the truth.

"B. Concerning the Relation of the Evangelical Lutheran Church Bodies to One Another

"In the case of those Church Bodies calling themselves Evangelical Lutheran, and subscribing the Confessions which have always been regarded as the standards of Evangelical Lutheran doctrine, the United Lutheran Church in America recognizes no doctrinal reasons against complete cooperation and organic union with such bodies.

C. Concerning the Organic Union of Protestant Churches

"In view of the widespread discussion concerning the organic union of the Protestant Churches in America, we declare:

"I. That we hold the union of Christians in a single organization to be of less importance than the agreement of Christians in the proclamation of the Gospel. We believe that the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church exists through and under divergent forms of external organization. Union of organization we hold, therefore, to be a matter of expediency; agreement in testimony to be a matter of principle.

"II. That holding the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments to be the primary function of every Church, we believe that a clear definition of what is meant by

'Gospel' and 'Sacrament' must precede any organic union of the Churches. We believe that a permanent and valid union of Churches must be based upon positive agreements concerning the truth for which the united Church Body is to stand. The Churches cannot unite as mere Protestants, but only as confessors. (Cf. A. V. 2; VII, 4.)

"III. That as a necessary step toward a genuine organic union, we believe that the Protestant Church Bodies in America should endeavor to set forth, definitely and positively, the views of Christian truth for which each of them does now actually stand, in order that by their clear and unequivocal testimony to what they hold to be the truth, the nature and extent of their agreements and disagreements may become apparent.

"IV. That we recognize the obligation which rests upon us to make a clear and full declaration concerning the truth which we hold, and are therefore ready, as opportunity offers, to give answer concerning our reasons for accepting and maintaining the doctrines and principles set forth in the Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

"V. That until a more complete unity of confession is attained than now exists, The United Lutheran Church in America is bound in duty and in conscience to maintain its separate identity as a witness to the truth which it knows; and its members, its ministers, its pulpits, its fonts and its altars must testify only to that truth.

D. Concerning Cooperative Movements among the Protestant Churches

"In view of the many proposals for cooperation of the Protestant Churches in various departments of practical activity, and in view of the many organizations already formed, and in process of formation, for the carrying on of such cooperative work, we declare

"I. That it is our earnest desire to cooperate with other Church Bodies in all such works as can be regarded as works of serving love, through which the faith of Christians finds expression; provided, that such cooperation does not involve the surrender of our interpretation of the Gospel, the denial of conviction, or the suppression of our testimony to what we hold to be the truth. (Cf. A. V, 4; VII, 3, above). In this connection, however, we call attention to the Constitution of the United Lutheran Church in America, Article VIII, Section 1, "No Synod, Conference or Board, or any official representative thereof, shall have the power of independent affiliation with general organizations and movements', and also to the By-Laws, Article V, Division C, Item 2, 'No official relationship with any other ecclesiastical bodies or their agencies shall be entered into by any Board or Committee of the United Lutheran Church in America, without the approval of the Church.'

"II. That we cannot give general approval to all cooperative movements and organizations of the Churches, since we hold that cooperation is not an end in itself, but merely a means to an end. Our attitude toward any such organization or movement must be determined by a consideration of

(a) The purposes which it seeks to accomplish.

(b) The principles on which it rests.

(c) The effect which our participation will produce upon the independent position of our Church as a witness to the truth of the Gospel which we confess. (Cf. C, VII, above.)

"III. That, holding the following doctrines and principles, derived from the Holy Scriptures, to be fundamental to the Christian message, we propose them as a positive basis of practical cooperation among the Protestant Churches. To avoid all possible misunderstandings or misconstructions of these statements, we declare that we do not regard them as a summary of Lutheran doctrine, or as an addition to, a substitute for, or a modification of the Confessions of our Church; nor do we propose them as an adequate basis for an organic union of the Churches, but merely as a criterion by which it may be possible for us to determine our attitude toward proposed movements of cooperation.

"1. The Fatherhood of God, revealed in His Son Jesus Christ, and the sonship bestowed by God, through Christ, upon all who believe in Him.

"2. The true Godhead of Jesus Christ, and His redemption of the world by His life and death and resurrection; and His living presence in His Church.

"3. The continued activity of God the Holy Spirit among men, calling them into the fellowship of Jesus Christ, and enlightening and sanctifying them through the gifts of His grace.

"4. The supreme importance of the Word of God and the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, as the means through which the Holy Spirit testifies of Christ and thus creates and strengthens faith. (In common with the whole Evangelical Lutheran Church, we confess the mystery of the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and we invite all Christians to a renewed study of the teachings of the Holy Scriptures concerning this Sacrament, and the Sacrament of Holy Baptism.)

"5. The authority of the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as the only rule and standard by which all doctrines and teachers are to be judged.

"6. The reality and universality of sin, and the inability of men, because of sin, to attain righteousness or earn salvation through their own character or works.

"7. The love, and the righteousness, of God, Who for Christ's sake bestows forgiveness and righteousness upon all who believe in Christ.

"8. The present existence upon earth of a kingdom of God, founded by His Son, Jesus Christ, not as an external organization, but as a spiritual reality and an object of faith.

"9. The hope of Christ's second coming, to be the Judge of the living and the dead, and to complete the kingdom of God.

"IV. That, in view of the above statements, our attitude toward proposed cooperative movements and organizations, already defined in principle in Section A, VII and D, I, above, must be subject to the following limitations;

"1. We cannot enter into any cooperative movement or organization which denies any of the doctrines or principles set forth in III, above.

"2. We cannot enter into any organization or movement which limits the cooperating Churches in their confession of the truth or their testimony against error. In all cooperative movements we claim the right, and regard it as a duty, to testify freely to the truth as it is set forth in the Confessions of our Church, and we believe that the same right must be guaranteed to every participating Church. All such testimony should receive a courteous and respectful hearing.

"3. We cannot enter into cooperative movements or organizations whose purposes lie outside the proper sphere of Church activity. In determining what that sphere is, we must be guided by the fundamental principle that the functions of the Church are the preaching of the Word, the administration of the Sacraments, and the performance of works of love (Cf. A, V, above). We hold that the use of the Church organization as an agency for securing the enactment and enforcement of law, or for the application of other methods of external force, is foreign to the true purpose for which the Church exists.

"V. That there are organizations and movements into which we cannot enter as a Church, in regard to which, however, the Church may definitely declare itself and which it may heartily commend to the pastors and members of its congregations as important spheres of activity for Christians, such as movements and organizations for social and political reform, the enforcement of law and order, the settlement of industrial conflicts, the improvement of the material environments of life, and the like.

E. CONCERNING MOVEMENTS AND ORGANIZATIONS INJURIOUS TO THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

"In view of the prevalence throughout our land of doctrines which are subversive of the Christian faith; and in view of the indifference manifested by many Christian people to the doctrines and principles of the teachers, sects and organizations which seek their adherence and support; and in view of the fact that through the acceptance of religious and other teachings which contradict the Gospel of Christ, the faith of Christians is endangered; we declare

"I. That we solemnly warn all our pastors and the members of our congregations against all teachers, sects and organizations of any kind, whose doctrines and principles contradict the truths set forth in Section D, III, of this Declaration, or which limit their adherents or members in a free confession of their Christian faith. (Cf. A. V. 3, above.)

"II. That we warn them especially against all teachers, sects and societies whose doctrines and principles deny the reality of sin, the personality of God, the full and complete Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ, and His redemption of the world by His sufferings and death, and the truth and authority of the Holy Scriptures; as well as against all teachers, sects and societies which teach that men can be saved from sin, or can become righteous before God, by their own works or by any other means than the grace and mercy of God in Jesus Christ. We believe that such doctrines are not only not Christian, but are anti-Christian and destructive of true Christian faith and life.

"III. That inasmuch as these and other false and dangerous doctrines are widely spread, not only by the activity of individual teachers, but also by the dissemination of literature and through the agency of societies and other organizations, calling themselves by various names which oftentimes conceal the real nature of the doctrines and principles for which they stand; we therefore lay it upon the consciences of the pastors and of the members of all our congregations to scrutinize with the utmost care the doctrines and principles of all teachers, sects, organizations and societies of every sort which seek their adherence and support, and to refuse such adherence and support in all cases of conflict or possible contradiction between these principles and doctrines and those set forth in Holy Scripture and in the Confessions of the Church. In the application of this principle the Church should always appeal to a conscience which it is her sacred duty to enlighten, patiently and persistently, from the Word of God. (Cf. also Constitution of The United Lutheran Church in America, Art. VIII, Sec. 6.)"

APPENDIX VI

REPORT OF THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE, 1930

Excerpts on Christian Unity

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH

"We are deeply convinced that the unity of the Church is the will of God; and we rejoice in the signs of a growing movement towards unity among Christian people generally. Such signs are apparent in all parts of the world in unions recently accomplished or in definite movements towards union now in progress.

. . . .

"We here repeat, as the expressions of our own solemn conviction, the following paragraphs of that Appeal to all Christian People issued by the last Lambeth Conference in 1920:

'We acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ which is His Body. We believe that the Holy Spirit has called us in a very solemn and special manner to associate ourselves in penitence and prayer with all those who deplore the divisions of Christian people, and are inspired by the vision and hope of a visible unity of the whole Church.

'I. We believe that God wills fellowship. By God's own act this fellowship was made in and through Jesus Christ, and its life is in His Spirit. We believe that it is God's purpose to manifest this fellowship, so far as this world is concerned, in an outward, visible, and united society, holding one faith, having its own recognized officers, using God-given means of grace, and inspiring all its members to the worldwide service of the Kingdom of God. This is what we mean by the Catholic Church.

'II. This united fellowship is not visible in the world today. On the one hand there are other ancient episcopal Communions in East and West to whom ours is bound by many ties of common faith and tradition. On the other hand there are the great non-Episcopal Communions, standing for rich elements of truth, liberty and life which might otherwise have been obscured or neglected. With them we are closely linked by many affinities, racial, historical and spiritual. We cherish the earnest hope that all these Communions, and our own, may be led by the Spirit into the unity of the Faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God. But in fact we are all organized in different groups, each one keeping to itself gifts that rightly belong to the whole fellowship, and tending to live its own life apart from the rest.

'III. The causes of division lie deep in the past and are by no means simple or wholly blameworthy. Yet none can doubt that self-will, ambition, and lack of charity among Christians have been principal factors in the mingled process, and that these, together with blindness to the sin of disunion, are still mainly responsible for the breaches of Christendom. We acknowledge this condition of broken fellowship to be contrary to God's will, and we desire frankly to confess our share in the guilt of thus crippling the Body of Christ and hindering the activity of His Spirit.

'IV. The times call us to a new outlook and new measures. The Faith cannot be adequately apprehended and the battle of the Kingdom cannot be worthily fought while the body is divided, and is thus unable to grow up into the fulness of the life of Christ. The time has come, we believe, for all the separated groups of Christians to agree in forgetting the things which are behind and reaching out towards the goal of a reunited Catholic Church. The removal of the barriers which have arisen between them will only be brought about by a new comradeship of those whose faces are definitely set this way.

'The vision which rises before us is that of a Church, genuinely Catholic, loyal to all Truth, and gathering into its fellowship all "who profess and call themselves Christians" within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present, shall be possessed in common, and made serviceable to the whole Body of Christ. Within this unity Christian Communions now separated from one another would retain much that has long been distinctive in their methods of worship and service. It is through a rich diversity of life and devotion that the unity of the whole fellowship will be fulfilled.'

"We desire especially to emphasize two points in the words just quoted. As Anglican Churchmen we make our own the confession of a share of the guilt for disunion. We believe that only when all can unite in penitence for their own share of responsibility and that of their fathers for the state of separation between Christians which has so grievously enfeebled the Church is there hope of union also in a reconstituted fellowship.

"With this penitence there must be combined the humility in which each Church is willing for a change of mind in regard to its customary teaching in one respect or another. If these customary teachings are to be combined in the united Church they will inevitably be to some extent reshaped in the process. But the humility required must go further; it must lead to a readiness on the part of each Church to admit that in some respects it may have been wrong. If Churches fear for their own repute as they seek reunion, they cannot have enough contrition or humility to obtain it.

"But, secondly, we recognize that during the period of division each of the bodies thus separated has under the guidance of the Holy Spirit developed spiritual resources and enjoyed spiritual treasures which must be conserved in the reunited Church, for they are the gift of Christ given to each in its own measure. We must not, for the sake of union, barter away our special heritage, for we hold it in trust for the whole Body of Christ; and we recognize also that those with whom we seek to be in fuller unity must equally safeguard the special treasures of their own tradition.

"Our consciousness of the injury to the Church's life resulting from our divisions inspires the hope that through the restoration of union there will come an increase of spiritual life, and that the attainment of further fellowship through union must both enrich each uniting Church by bringing to it a fuller share in the gifts of others, and also enhance and sanctify the gifts brought by each to the common life.

. . . .

"In some directions, as will appear, we regretfully find ourselves unable to agree in recommending such reciprocal advances as many of our fellow Christians in other communions would welcome. In particular we cannot enter into any scheme of federation involving interchangeability of ministries, while differences on points of order that we think essential still remain, for this would seem to us both to encourage and to express an acquiescence in essential disunion. But recognizing the unity of Christian faith and experience which so many who are still divided in Church Order enjoy, and remembering the weakness of our divided Christian witness in face of a largely pagan world, we would urge the appropriateness and importance of united efforts to preach our one Gospel to those who are outside the membership of all organized communions. Such joint evangelism, wisely planned and carried out under due authority, may not only be effective in converting power; it may also at once proclaim and strengthen existing spiritual fellowship, and help to pave the way towards that corporate unity in which alone our witness can be fully effective, and our fellowship completely expressed.

"But while urging such cooperative action we must here give our chief attention to the difficulties which confront us as we face the task of bringing together in one organic unity the varied inheritance of spiritual treasure enjoyed by the several communions now separated from one another.

"It is no part of our duty to specify what will be the contributions of others to the common life of the United Church. But we may reasonably be asked to say what we conceive to be our own. Our special character and, as we believe, our peculiar contribution to the Universal Church, arises from the fact that, owing to historic circumstances, we have been enabled to combine in our one fellowship the traditional Faith and Order of the Catholic

Church with that immediacy of approach to God through Christ to which the Evangelical Churches especially bear witness, and freedom of intellectual enquiry, whereby the correlation of the Christian revelation and advancing knowledge is constantly effected. This very combination makes difficult the manifestation of our real unity, and sometimes creates an impression of vagueness and indecisiveness which others are able to avoid. Yet we believe that such difficulties are incidental to that mode of corporate life which, as we are persuaded, most facilitates the search for truth, and best responds to and most adequately exhibits the diverse operations of the one Spirit.

"But it is our maintenance of the traditional Faith and Order which chiefly concerns us here, because the problem confronting those who work for the restoration of union is primarily one of Faith and Order. Appreciation of spiritual devotion affords ground for desiring reunion, but agreement upon Faith and Order is the essential matter, in the sense that to secure a common Faith and Order is in itself to accomplish reunion. Previous Lambeth Conferences have approved, as the Anglican basis for negotiations with a view to reunion, the four points sometimes referred to as the Lambeth Quadrilateral; the Scriptures; the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds; the Sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion; and the Historic Episcopate.

"Of these the last appeared in the Lambeth Appeal as the one means of providing the 'ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church,' which is, in the Appeal, the fourth point declared to be involved in the visible unity of the Church.

"Among the Churches with which we have held Conference we find that in the Episcopal Churches these four points are all secured; in the non-Episcopal Churches we find that as regards three of the four points there is such a measure of agreement as to form a hopeful basis of further negotiation; these are the Canon of Scripture, the Faith as set forth and safeguarded by the Creeds, and the use of the two Sacraments of the Gospel. The outstanding point is the Historic Episcopate, and on this we desire to offer some further explication.

"When we speak of the Historic Episcopate we mean the Episcopate as it emerged in the clear light of history from the time when definite evidence begins to be available. It is, indeed, well known that the origin of episcopacy has been much debated. Without entering into the discussion of theories which divide scholars we may affirm shortly that we see no reason to doubt the statement made in the Preface to our Ordinal that 'from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests and Deacons.' Whatever variety of system may have existed in addition in the earlier age, it is universally agreed that by the end of the second century episcopacy had no effective rival. Among all the controversies of the fourth and fifth centuries the episcopal ministry was never a subject of dispute. We may therefore reasonably claim that it is 'historic' in a sense in which no other now can ever be. The Episcopate occupies a position which is, in point of historic development, analogous to that of the Canon of Scripture and of the Creeds. In the first days there was no Canon of New Testament Scripture, for the books afterwards included in it were still being written. For a time different Churches had different writings which they regarded as authoritative. The Canon was slowly formed, and the acceptance of a single Canon throughout the Church took several generations. So, too, the Apostles' Creed is the result of a process of growth which we can in large measure trace. If the Episcopate, as we find it established universally by the end of the second century, was the result of a like process of adaptation and growth in the organism of the Church, that would be no evidence that it lacked divine authority, but rather that the life of the Spirit within the Church had found it to be the most appropriate organ for the functions which it discharged.

"In the course of time the Episcopate was greatly affected by secular forces, which bent it to many purposes alien to its true character, and went far to obscure its spiritual purpose. It is hard to recognize the successors of the Apostles in the feudal Prelates of the mediæval Church, or in the 'peers spiritual' of eighteenth century England. Moreover, the essential character of the Episcopate was distorted by the development of the Papal Supremacy. Such deviations from its true principle are mainly responsible for the general abandonment of Episcopacy by the Protestant Churches. The Historic Episcopate as we understand it goes behind the perversions of history to the original conception of the Apostolic Ministry.

"For it is not a mere fact, but an institution fulfilling certain purposes. As an institution it was, and is, characterized by succession in two forms: the succession in office and the succession of consecration. And it had generally recognised functions; the general superintendence of the Church and more especially of the Clergy; the maintenance of unity in the one Eucharist; the ordination of men to the ministry; the safeguarding of the faith; and the administration of the discipline of the Church. There have been different interpretations of the relation of these elements in the Historic Episcopate to one another; but the elements themselves are constant. When, therefore, we say that we must insist on the Historic Episcopate but not upon any theory or interpretation of it, we are not to be understood as insisting on the office apart from the functions. What we uphold is the Episcopate, maintained in successive generations by continuity of succession and consecration, as it has been throughout the history of the Church from the earliest times, and discharging those functions which from the earliest times it has discharged.

"We readily agree that there are other elements in the full life of the Church, and we hold that the episcopate should be 'constitutional' in the sense that provision should be made for the due cooperation of the presbyterate and the congregation of Christ's faithful people in the ordering of the Church's life. Indeed, this is already secured in varying degrees in all parts of the Anglican Communion by the revival of Diocesan and Provincial Synods, or by other similar means. We recognize that in this respect we have much to learn and to gain from the traditions and customs of the non-Episcopal Churches. But our special responsibility as an Episcopal Church is to bring into the complete life of the united Church those elements which we have received and hold in trust. Chief among these, in the matter of Order, is the Historic Episcopate.

"In laying this emphasis on our own inheritance, we emphatically declare that we do not call in question the spiritual reality of the ministries now exercised in non-Episcopal communions. On the contrary, we reiterate the declaration of the Lambeth Conference of 1920, that 'these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace.' But when we consider the problem which must be paramount in all our discussions, namely, the restoration of the broken unity of Christ's Body and the drawing together of the separated groups of His followers, we realise that one necessary element in that visible fellowship must be a ministry universally acknowledged. Thus considered, there is at present no ministry which fully corresponds with the purpose of God. Yet we are persuaded that the historic continuity of the Episcopal ministry provides evidence of the Divine intention in this respect such as to constitute a stewardship which we are bound to discharge.

"We cannot regard the maintenance of separately organized churches as a matter indifferent or unimportant. The will and intention to preserve the unity of the Spirit in the Body of Christ must of necessity underlie all its organization; and where that unity has been broken the earnest desire to restore union makes possible a recognition by the Church, in some respects, of ministries which, in separation, must stand on a different footing. The will and intention of Christians to perpetuate separately organized churches makes it inconsistent in principle for them to come before our Lord to be united as one body by the sacrament of His own Body and Blood. The general rule of our Church must therefore be held to exclude indiscriminate intercommunion or any such intercommunion as expresses acquiescence in the continuance of separately organized churches.

"From what has been already said it will be evident why we hold as a general principle that intercommunion should be the goal of rather than a means to the restoration of union, and also why the general rule of our Church has been, as set forth by the last Lambeth Conference, that members of the Anglican Churches should receive the Holy Communion only from ministers of their own Church or of Churches in full communion with it.

. . . .

"In the experience of many of us this heritage of Faith and Order seems to be one and indivisible, and to have its roots in the redemptive method of God in the Incarnation. To those who share that view the historic Order and the prominence of sacramental worship which commonly accompanies it stand for and bears constant witness to the God-given element in the Christian life, which is prior to and independent of all subjective feeling on our part. But whether or not we find Faith and Order thus welded together in our experience, we are all united in thankfulness for the heritage that is ours; and for it we are bound to stand.

"But while we thus stand for the Historic Episcopate as a necessary element in any union in which the Anglican Communion can take part, and have given our reasons for so doing, we do not require of others acceptance of those reasons, or of any one particular theory or interpretation of the Episcopate as a condition of union. We recognise as fully the gifts of the one Spirit entrusted to those others, and their equal responsibility to maintain their several trusts; and we are content to believe that the acceptance of the Episcopate itself, in its continuity of succession and consecration, and in the discharge of its historic functions will bring to the united Church those gifts of Grace which, as we believe, the Providence of God has associated with it."

This message, however, needs for its interpretation utterances contained in reports and resolutions and the Encyclical letter of the Lambeth Conference of 1930, such as these:

Schemes of Reunion

"In view of the various schemes of reunion and other projects and advances toward union and intercommunion which have been the subject of discussion or negotiation, the Conference reminds the Church that it is a paramount duty to seek unity among Christians in every direction, and assures all who are working for this end of its cordial support in their endeavors; it also reminds the Church that until full and final schemes are set out and terms of intercommunion are definitely arranged, the expression of final judgments on individual schemes is premature.

COOPERATION IN EVANGELISM

"Meanwhile the Conference urges the desirability of organizing and participating in efforts of Evangelism in cooperation with Christians of other Communions, both as a means of bearing effective witness to the multitudes who are detached from all forms of organized Christianity and as a means of expressing and strengthening that sense of unity in the Gospel which binds together in spiritual fellowship those who own allegiance to different Churches."

"We welcome all gatherings like those held at Stockholm, Lausanne and Jerusalem, in which representatives of different Christian Communions are brought together in conference on aspects of Christian faith and service. We hope that these efforts may lead to some kind of permanent association of all the Christian Churches that may become the spiritual counterpart of the League of Nations. Many other international associations have grown up in recent years, and we believe that they constitute a valuable asset for goodwill among the peoples of the world. Isolation breeds misunderstanding; and closer contact between men of different nations is the best corrective of this danger."

APPENDIX VII

STATEMENT OF THE EASTERN ORTHODOX DELEGATES AT LAUSANNE, 1927.

"Brethren, on receiving the invitation of the Organising Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order seven years ago, the Orthodox Church answered readily by sending representatives from her particular Orthodox Churches to the preliminary Conference in 1920 at Geneva. That delegation of the Orthodox Church put before the Conference a united declaration in general terms of the teaching of their Church in the matter of faith and order and at its conclusion recommended that before any discussion of the reunion of the Churches in faith and order, a League of Churches should be established for their mutual cooperation in regard to the social and moral principles of Christendom. Further, when the Orthodox Church was invited a short time ago to take part through her representatives in the present Conference, although many of her particular Churches are in distress so grave as to threaten their very existence, she hastened to send her delegations to it.

"Accordingly, we, the undersigned, delegates of the Orthodox Church, being inspired by a sincere feeling of love and by a desire to achieve an understanding, have taken part in every meeting held here for the purpose of promoting closer brotherhood and fellowship between the representatives of the different Churches and for the general good and welfare of the whole body of Christians. But while sharing the general labours of the Conference both in delivering addresses as arranged in the programme and in taking part in the open debates, as also in the work of the Sections, we have concluded with regret that the bases assumed for the foundation of the Reports which are to be submitted to the vote of the Conference, are inconsistent with the principles of the Orthodox Church which we represent.

"Therefore, we judge it to be a matter of conscience that with the exception of the first we must abstain from voting in favour of the two Reports which are now ready. Although both in the papers read, in speeches, in debate and in statements made in the three Sections, we Orthodox have already made plain and clear what are the points of view and the conceptions of the Orthodox Church in regard to the subjects under discussion, we hold it to be of importance that we should specify here certain points in order to make manifest the differences which separate us from other members of the Conference. For example, while the Report on the Message of the Church, since it is drafted on the basis of the teaching of the Holy Scripture, is in accordance with the Orthodox conception and can be accepted by us, it is otherwise with the two other Reports, on the Nature of the Church and upon the Common Confession of the Faith of the Church. The drafting of these two latter was carried out on a basis of compromise between what in our understanding are conflicting ideas and meanings, in order to arrive at an external agreement in the letter alone: whereas, as has often at other times been emphasised in statement by representatives of the Orthodox Church, in matters of faith and conscience there is room for no compromise. For us, two different meanings cannot be covered by, and two different concepts cannot be deduced from, the same words of a generally agreed statement. Nor can we Orthodox hope that an agreement reached upon such statements would remain lasting.

"That the drafting committees have realised the existence of this disagreement is apparent from many of the notes which they have placed in the Reports and which leave full liberty upon matters which at least we Orthodox hold to be fundamental. Thus for example, we Orthodox cannot conceive a united Church in which some of its members would hold that there is only one source of divine revelation, namely, Holy Scripture alone, but others would affirm that apostolic tradition is the necessary completion of Holy Scripture. While the full freedom so accorded in the Report to each Church to use its own confession of faith would make those confessions of indifferent value in themselves, on the other hand, nothing but confusion as to the one common conception of the Faith of the so united single Church could arise.

"The Orthodox Church adheres fixedly to the principle that the limits of individual liberty of belief are determined by the definitions made by the whole Church, which definitions we maintain to be obligatory on each individual. This principle holds good for us not only as to the present members of the Orthodox Church, but also as to those who, in future, may become united with it in faith and order. Moreover, the symbols which would be accepted by the united Church acquire their importance (in our conception as Orthodox) not only from the fact of their being historical witnesses of the faith of the primitive Church, but above all because the Church has affirmed their validity in her Ecumenical Councils. It should be unnecessary for us to add that the Orthodox Church recognises and accepts as an Ecumenical Symbol only the Creed of Nicea-Constantinople.

"That which holds good for us in regard to the Ecumenical Symbol, holds good also in regard to the dogmatic definitions of the Seven Ecumenical Councils, the authority of which no Orthodox would be justified in shaking.

"Therefore the mind of the Orthodox Church is that reunion can take place only on the basis of the common faith and confession of the ancient, undivided Church of the seven Ecumenical Councils and of the first eight centuries.

"Although the Reports of the other three Sections are not yet to hand, the process of debate upon them makes it evident that agreement on them can be reached only by vague phrases, or by a compromise of antithetical opinions. Thus, for example, we cannot conceive how agreement can be made possible between two conceptions which agree that the existence of the ministry of the Church is by the will of Christ, but differ as to whether that ministry was instituted by Christ Himself in its three degrees of bishop, priest and deacon. In the same way we judge there to be no practical value in an agreed formula as to the necessity of sacraments in the Church when there is a fundamental difference between the Churches not only in regard to their number but also as to their general significance, as to their particular essential nature and as to their particular effects.

"This being so, we cannot entertain the idea of a reunion which is confined to a few common points of verbal statement; for according to the Orthodox Church, where the totality of the faith is absent there can be no *communio in sacris*.

"Nor can we here apply that principle of economy which in the past the Orthodox Church has applied under quite other circumstances in the case of those who came to her with a view to union with her.

"In consequence, while we, the undersigned Orthodox representatives, must refrain from agreeing to any Report other than that upon the Message of the Church, which we accept and are ready to vote upon, we desire to declare that in our judgment the most which we can now do is to enter into cooperation with other Churches in the social and moral sphere on a basis of Christian love. Further, we desire to add that as Orthodox delegates we should view a partial reunion of those Churches which share the same principles with satisfaction as a precedent to general reunion, inasmuch as it would thus be easier for our Orthodox Church to discuss reunion with the Churches which had so united into a single Church and had a single faith, than with many Churches with different faiths.

"In making it plain that we have arrived at our decision only in obedience to the dictates of our conscience, we beg to assure the Conference that we have derived much comfort here from the experience that, although divided by dogmatic differences, we are one with our brethren here in faith in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Declaring that in the future we shall not cease to devote ourselves to labour for a closer approach of the Churches, we add that we shall pray to God without ceasing that by the operation of His Holy Spirit He will take away all existing hindrances and will guide us to that unity for which the Founder and Ruler of the Church prayed to His Heavenly Father: 'that they all may be one as we are one.'

"We close with the intercession that our Lord will richly give His blessing to one and all who labour in sincerity and in His fear for the establishment of His Kingdom among men."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Christian Unity," by Gaius Jackson Slosser. Dutton, 1929. Especially valuable for its discussion of the earlier periods of the church and for its completeness and comprehensiveness.

"The Primitive Church," by Canon Streeter. Macmillan, 1929.

"Christian Unity: Its Principles & Possibilities." A study by the Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook. Association Press, 1921.

"Jerusalem Meeting." The Addresses, Actions, and Messages. 8 volumes. International Missionary Council, 1928.

"The Stockholm Conference on Life and Work, 1925." The Addresses, Actions, and Messages. By G. K. A. Bell. Oxford University Press.

"Faith and Order: Lausanne, 1927." A full story of the World Conference on Faith and Order. Doran.

"Lambeth Conference, 1930." Encyclical Letter, Resolutions and Reports. Macmillan.

"Re-Thinking Missions." Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry. Harper & Bros., 1932.

"History of the Federal Council." The History up to 1912. By E. B. Sanford. S. S. Scranton Co.

"The Progress of Church Federation." History of the Federal Council to 1922. By Charles S. Macfarland. Revell.

"Twenty Years of Church Federation, History to 1928." Edited by Samuel McCrea Cavert. The Federal Council.

"International Christian Movements," by Charles S. Macfarland. Revell, 1925.

"Protestant Cooperation in American Cities." A Survey and a Critique. By H. Paul Douglass. Institute of Social and Religious Research, 1930.

"Church Comity." A Study of Cooperative Church Extension in Cities. By H. Paul Douglass. Doubleday, Doran, 1929.

"Community Programs for Cooperating Churches," by Roy B. Guild. Association Press, 1920.

"Interchurch Community Programs." Practical guidance for local communities. By Charles R. Zahniser. Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1932.

"Six Thousand Country Churches." A Survey of the State of Ohio in 1919. By Charles O. Gill and Gifford Pinchot. Macmillan.

"Community Organization in Religious Education." An illustrative study of local cooperation in the field of education. By Hugh Hartshorne and J. Q. Miller. Yale University Press, 1932.

"The Churches of the Federal Council." Edited by Charles S. Macfarland. Revell, 1916. Sets forth their distinctive characteristics.

"Protestant Europe: Its Crisis and Outlook," by Adolf Keller and George Stewart. Doran, 1927. Includes the European Cooperative Movements. Dr. Keller is the acknowledged authority in Europe and Dr. Stewart is preeminent as an interpreter.

"Documents on Christian Unity," by G. K. A. Bell. Oxford University Press. Two series in two volumes containing official pronouncements.

"Corpus Confessionum," by Prof. Cajus Fabricius of the University of Berlin, with the cooperation of Alfred E. Garvie, Bishop Germanos, Arthur C. Headlam, Adolf Keller and Charles S. Macfarland. A complete compilation of the creeds and confessions of all Christian bodies, now appearing serially, in both English and German.

"Handbook of the Churches." Issued by the Federal Council. 5 volumes, 1921 to 1933. Descriptive and statistical, with chapters on Church History and Progress.

"The Social Work of the Churches," edited by F. Ernest Johnson, Dep't. of Research and Education of the Federal Council, 1930. A Handbook of Information.

Complete Historical Material on the Federal and Cooperative

Movements will be found in the Annual and Quadrennial Volumes of the Federal Council.

"The Federal Council Bulletin," issued monthly, gives constant information on the progress of Federation and Cooperation. "The International Journal of Religious Education" and "Christian Education" cover their field.

For European viewpoints the following volumes are representative:

"Die Einigung der Kirche," von René Heinrich Wallau. Furche-Verlag, Berlin, 1925.

"Die Stockholmer Bewegung," von Adolf Deissmann. Furche-Verlag, Berlin, 1927.

"L'Unité Chrétienne," par André Paul. Les Editions Rieder, Paris, 1930.

"Der Weg der dialectischen Theologie durch die kirchliche Welt," von Adolf Keller. Chr. Kaiser Verlag. München, 1931 (now being translated to be published by Macmillan).

"Dynamis: Formen und Kräfte des amerikanischen Protestantismus," von Adolf Keller. J. C. B. Mohr. Tübingen.

INDEX

Addams, Jane, 286
Adventists, Seventh Day, 175
Alivisatos, Hamilcar, 166
Alliance, the Evangelical, 35 ff.
Alliance of Presbyterian and Reformed Churches, 123
American Bible Society, 33 ff.
American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, 50 ff.
American Relief Administration, 99, 145
American Sunday School Union, 35
American Tract Society, 35
Anglican Communion, The, x, 197 ff., 322
Anglo-Catholics, 151, 196 ff.
Anthony, Alfred Williams, 87, 130 ff., 295
Apostles' Creed, The, 21
Apostolic Church, The, 16 ff.
Apostolic Succession, 183, 321
Architecture, Church, 145
Associate Reformed Church, The, 50
Atkins, Gaius Glenn, 73
Atkinson, Henry A., 109, 119
Augsburg Confession, The, 123
Australia, Unity in, 124
Austria, Unity in, 121
Awakening, The Great, 31

Bacon, Leonard, 36
Bader, Jesse M., 135
Baptism, 14, 32
Baptist Churches, The, 87, 184 ff.
Baptist Convention, The Northern, 184 ff.
Baptist Convention, The Southern, 62, 187
Baptists, Seventh Day, The, 184
Barnes, Lemuel C., 55
Barth, Karl, and Barthianism, 175, 260 ff., 283, 290
Bartlet, J. Vernon, 165
Barton, James L., 208
Baxter, Richard, 26, 49, 236
Beaven, Albert W., 94
Beecher, Henry Ward, 40, 43
Belgium, 121
Bethesda Conference, The, 107
Bible Societies, 34
Bible Society, The American, 5, 34
Bible Society, The British and Foreign, 33.
Bible, Translation of the, 50
Boulder City, 133
Brent, Charles H., 160, 196
Brewer, David J., 141
Briand, Aristide, 122
Brown, William Adams, 165, 167
Brunner, Edmund de S., 135
Brunner, Emil, 283
Bucer, Martin, 23
Bullinger, Heinrich, 23
Bunyan, John, 269

Cadman, S. Parkes, 94
Cady, J. Cleveland, 46
Caldwell, Robert J., 76
Calvin, John, 23 ff., 178, 179
Canada, The Churches of, 32, 124
Canal Zone, Union Churches, 97, 145
Carlyle, Thomas, 1, 32
Carnegie, Andrew, 106
Cavert, Samuel McCrea, 275
Census, U. S. Religious, 31
Central Bureau of Inter-Church Aid, and Central Bureau for Relief of the Evangelical Churches of Europe, 108, 120, 192
Chalcedon, Council of, 21
Chamberlain, Leander T., 44
Chaplains, Army and Navy, 97, 145
Chase, Caroline W., 135

China, 143
China, Christian Council in, 110
China, Famine and Flood Relief, 99
Christian Church, The, 87, 180
Christian Endeavor, The Society of, 5, 105, 226
Christian Science, 174
Christian Student Federation, The, 120
Christian Unity; Two Methods of Approach, x, 90, 91, 148, 149, 155, 322, 323
Christlieb, Theodor, 40
Church and State, 72 ff.
Church Conference on Social Work, The, 139
Church Peace Union, The, 106, 109, 142
City Planning, 319 ff.
Clinchy, Everett R., 145
Cole, Charles C., 146
Comity, 129 ff.
Community Churches and the Community Church Workers of the U. S. A., 5, 81 ff., 223, 279
Conferences on Christian Unity, Coming, x
Congregational and Christian Churches, The, 87, 180, 181
Congregational Form of Government, The, 19
Congo State, Conditions in the, 55
Connecticut, The Christian League of, 129
Constantine, Emperor, 20
"Copec," 118
Copenhagen, Bethesda Conference at, 107
Council of Church Boards of Education, The, 4, 138
Country Life, Commission on, 97, 135
Creeds and Doctrines, 8 ff., 13, 19, 22, 28, 113, 151, 156 ff., 218, 325
Cumberland Presbyterian Church, The, 87
Cummings, Charles S., 129
Cyrille Lucaris, Patriarch, 206, 207
Czechoslovakia, Unity in, 121
Dearmer, Percy, 163, 206
Denominations, Rise of, 3, 30 ff.; now in the U. S., 224
Devins, John B., 46
Disciples of Christ, The, 45, 149, 188
Dodge, William E. (elder), 39
Dodge, William E. (younger), 39, 46
Douglass, H. Paul, 7, 79 ff., 134, 219, 222, 237
Duraeus (John Dury), 26
Dwight, Meletiah E., 54

Eastern Orthodox Churches, The, 98, 118, 120, 151 ff., 172, 205, 206 ff., 208, 209
Eastern Religions, 238 ff., 243
Economics and Christianity, 303 ff.
Ecumenical Conference, Committee on, 98, 117
Ecumenical Councils, The, 20 ff.
Ecumenical Missionary Conference, The, 110
Eddington, A. S., 288
Edinburgh Missionary Conference, The, 110 ff.
Editorial Council of the Religious Press, 97
Education, Christian, 97, 137 ff., 223
Ellwood, Charles A., 284 ff.
Emhardt, William C., 196, 205
Emrich, Jeanette W., 143
English-speaking Churches in Europe, 123
Episcopal Form of Government, The, 19
Eucharistic Unity, 198 ff.
Europe, Federal Unity in, 120 ff.
Europe, Commission on Relation with Religious Bodies in, 97
Evangelical Alliance, The, 5, 35 ff., 105
Evangelical Alliance, Doctrinal Basis of, 37
Evangelical Church, Union with Evangelical Association, 87, 184
Evangelism and Life Service, 97, 135 ff.
Evangelical Synod of N. A., 183

Faith and Order, World Conference on, 148 ff.
Faith and Belief, Distinction between, 16, 19, 28, 149, 157 ff., 324 ff.
Faith, The New Age of, 314
Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, 4, 33, 44, 47, 53, 54 ff., 87 ff., 120, 135 ff., 235, 249
Federation, Early Approaches to, 52
Federation of Churches and Christian Workers (N. Y.), 46
Federation of Churches and Christian Workers, The National, 46 ff., 53 ff.
Filene, Edward A., 126
Financial and Fiduciary Matters, Committee on, 98, 319
Finney, Charles G., 136
Fisher, Galen, 237
Fiske, George Walter, 284
Five Year Program on Home Missions, The, 133
Fleming, Daniel J., 243
Foreign Missions, 49, 109 ff., 127 ff., 236 ff., 247
Foreign Missions Conference of North America, The, 4, 51, 103, 127, 240, 241, 252 ff.
Foreign Missions, Laymen's Inquiry, 236 ff., 320
Foster, Allyn K., 259
Fourth Gospel, The, 17
France and Belgium, Relief of Churches in, 98, 106, 107
Free Churches of Great Britain, The, 192, 205
French Protestant Federation, The, 121, 124
Friends (also Quakers), The, 142, 184, 226, 289
Froendt, Antonia H., 108
Fry, C. Luther, 237
Function and Structure of the Federal Council, x, 88, 225, 238 ff.
Fundamentalism, 171, 174, 175, 262

Galicia, Intercommunion in, 124
Gardiner, Robert H., 256
Gardner, Katherine, 140
Gardner, Lucy, 118
Geneva, Conference of 1920 and Headquarters, 118, 119, 120
German Church Federation, The, 124
Germany, The Inner Mission in, 122
Gill, Charles O., 135
Gladden, Washington, 129
Gloucester, Bishop of, 164 ff., 279
Gnostics, The, 17
God, Man's Relation to, 264 ff.
Goodell, Charles L., 135, 136
Goguel, Maurice, 15
Goodrich, Chauncey W., 108
Gordon, Linley V., 109
Gore, Bishop, 161
Government, Coöperation with, 145
Grace, The Doctrine of, 164 ff.
Great Britain; National Council of Evangelical Free Churches, 121; Federal Council of Evangelical Free Churches, 121
Greek Church, The (Eastern Orthodox), 21
Grose, Howard B., 39
Grotius, Hugo, 24
Guild, Roy B., 79, 147
Gulick, Sidney L., 141
Guy, Harvey H., 237

Haven, William I., 54
Hart, Hornell, 291
Haynes, George E., 140
Helvetian Confession, The, 23
Hendrix, Eugene R., 94
Henriod, H. L., 119
Heresies in the Early Church, 21
Herold, Dean O., 117
Herrnhut Conference, The, 253
History, Church, American Society of, 245
Holmes, Harry N. 109
Home Missions and Comity, 128 ff.
Home Missions Congress, 84, 128
Home Missions Council, 4, 57 ff., 103, 128 ff., 232
Home Missions, Federal Council's Committee on, 134
Hooker, Elizabeth R., 84
Hoover, Herbert, 75, 99

Hoover Dam, 133
Hopkins, Robert M., 137
Hostile Forces, 143 ff., 170
Hughes, Charles E., 46
Huguenot-Walloon New Netherlands Tercentenary, 98, 145
Humanism, 160, 228, 260, 262, 284, 290, 294
Hyde, William DeWitt, 129 ff.
Hymns, Unity in, 159, 280, 326

India, Conference in Calcutta, 110; Union in, 128
India, South, United Church in, 201 ff.
Industrial Policies of the Federal Council, 76 ff.
Industry, The Church and, 138 ff., 304 ff.
Industry, The Steel, 140, 144
Inman, Samuel G., 111
Institute of Social and Religious Research, The, x, 1, 219
Interchurch Conference of 1905, 54 ff.
Interchurch World Movement, 68 ff., 102, 174, 272
International Christian Social Institute, 120, 289
International Council of Religious Education, 4, 80, 81, 103, 138, 170
International European Protestant Loan Association, 122
International Justice and Goodwill Commission on, 141 ff.
International Relations, 310
International Labor Organization, 126, 289
International Missionary Council, x, 113 ff., 119, 120, 124, 127, 147, 170, 172, 192, 207, 218, 245, 247, 249, 255
International Sunday School Association, 137
Interseminary Missionary Alliance, 51

James, St., 18
Japan, 143
Japan, Commission on Relations with, 97
Jay, John, 41
Jerusalem Conference. *See* International Missionary Council
Jesus, Teaching of, 12 ff., 259
Jews, Coöperation with, 146, 193
Jews and Christians, Committee on Goodwill Between, 98, 145
Johnson, F. Ernest, 138, 146, 287
Jones, Rufus, 29
Judgment, Moral and Divine, 266 ff.
Judson, Adoniram, 50

Keller, Adolf, 107 ff., 119, 147, 198, 261 ff., 284
Keller, Albert Galloway, 286, 287, 291
Kelly, Robert L., 138
Kimball, Alfred R., 46, 275
King, William R., 135
Kingdom of Heaven, 14, 15
Knubel, Frederick H., 108, 191

Laidlaw, Walter, 46
Labor Day and Sunday, 140
Labor, The Church and, 289
Lambeth Conferences, The, 121, 149, 195, 197 ff.
Lambeth Quadrilateral, The, 197
Landis, Benson Y., 146
Latin America, Missions, 4, 111, 248
Latin Church, The, 21
Lausanne Conference. *See* World Conference on Faith and Order
Lawson, Albert G., 55
Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry, xi, 236 ff., 320
Laymen's Missionary Movement, 44, 51
League of Churches, A, 207
League, Open and Institutional Church, The, 45 ff.
League of Nations, The, 126, 193
League of Women Voters, The, 293
Legislation, The Church and, 74 ff.
Leiper, Henry S., 121, 147
Lippmann, Walter, 294
Lobbying, The Church and, 75
Lombroso, Gina, 126
London Missionary Society, The, 50, 51, 110
Lord, Rivington D., 54

Luther, Martin, 23 ff., 123
Lutheran Churches, The, 23, 25, 53, 61, 136, 188 ff., 192-226
Lutheran, Missouri Synod, 190
Lutheran, United Church in America, 87, 189 ff.
Lutheran World Convention, 124
Lutheran and Reformed Churches in Europe, Relations between, 123 ff., 191
Lynch, Frederick, 109, 117

Magill, Hugh S., 138
Maine, Interdenominational Commission of, 47, 78, 130 ff.
Marburg Conference, 171
Marriage and the Home, 98, 140, 307
Marriages, Mixed, 214
Massachusetts, Church Federation of, 54
Mathews, Shailer, 94
McConnell, Francis J., 94
McDowell, William F., 55
McGiffert, Arthur C., 22
McNeill, John T., 178 ff.
Mears, David O., 35
Men and Religion Movement, 79
Mennonites, The, 289
Mercy and Relief, Committee on, 98, 145
Methodist Bodies in England, 124, 177
Methodist Churches, The, 182
Methodist Episcopal Church, The, 116
Methodist Protestant Church, The, 180, 182
Meyer, F. B., 142
Mexico, 143
Mihalcesco, Professor P. J., 206
Miller, Kenneth D., 108
Miller, Rufus W., 55
Millikan, R. A., 288, 291
Ministry, The, 172, 183, 186, 187, 197, 201, 321
Missionary Education Movement, The, 44, 138
Missionary, Laymen's Movement, xi, 44
Monod, André, 106
Moody, Dwight L., 136
Moore, John M., 225
Moravians, The, 184
Moss, Leslie B., 127
Mott, John R., 111, 113
Munger, Theodore, 274
Myers, James, 140

National Catholic Welfare Council, 146
National Conference of Jews and Christians, 215
National Conference of Social Work, 139
National Federation of Churches and Christian Workers, 53 ff.
Near East Relief, 99, 106, 108
Negro Church Bodies, 140
Nestorians, The, 211
Newman, Cardinal, 159, 326
New Zealand, Union in, 124
Nicene Creed, 22, 151, 160
Niebuhr, Reinhold, 315
Nixon, Justin Wroe, 285 ff.
North, Frank Mason, 11, 92, 295, 326

O'Brien, Morgan J., 216
Old Catholic Church, x, 205
Oman, John, 29
Open and Institutional Church League, 45, 53
Orient, Committee on Relations with, The, 97
Organic Union, 148 ff.
Organic Union, Family and Homogeneous Groups, 87
Organizations for Unity, Existing, 3 ff.
Osaka, Foreign Mission Conference in, 50

Panama Mission Congress, 111
Pan-Protestantism, 150, 171, 205
Papal Authority and Infallibility, 210 ff.
Paris, Theological Faculty of, 122
Paul, 17 ff., 257, 277
Peace and Arbitration, Commission on, 97, 142

Peet, W. W., 208
Pentecost, 16, 324
Personal Religion, 158, 159, 322, 323
Petersmann, Werner, 274
Philadelphia Plan of Union, 70
Philippines, The, 143
Pinchot, Gifford, 135
Poland, Unity in, 121
Porter, Frank Chamberlin, 18 ff.
Pope Celestine, 212
Pope Pius XI, x, 21, 210 ff.
Powell, Lyman P., 86
Prayer, Fellowship of, The, 136, 228, 317
Prayer, Weeks of, 38
Presbyterian Church, The, 50, 87
Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.; Union with Cumberland Presbyterian Church, 87; with Welsh Calvinistic Church, 183
Presbyterian Form of Government, 19
Presbyterian and Reformed Churches, 182 ff., 226
Press, Religious, The, 316 ff.
Price, Orlo J., 147
Prime, Samuel Irenaeus, 41
Prohibition and Temperance, 73 ff.
Prophets, Old Testament, 15
Protestant Bodies, Attitude towards Unity, 178 ff., 191 ff.
Protestant Episcopal Church, 62, 136, 149, 194 ff.
Protestantism, 178 ff.
Publicity, Religious, 317
Pupin, Michael, 288, 291

Questionnaire on Christian Union, 219 ff.

Rabbis, Conference of Jewish, 146
Race Relations, 97, 140 ff., 309
Radburn (N. J.) Council of Religion, 85, 133
Radio Ministry, 145, 216, 317 ff.
Rauschenbusch, Walter, 61, 285
Raven, Charles E., 29, 261
Red Cross, American, 99
Redemption, The Gospel of, 268 ff.
Reformation, The Protestant, 1, 22, 23 ff.
Reformed Church (The Original), 23, 25
Reformed Church in America, The, 50
Reformed Church in the U. S., The, 183
Reformed Churches, The Presbyterian and, 182 ff.
Reformed and Lutheran Churches in Europe, Conferences between, 123 ff.
Relations Abroad, Department of, 120
Research and Education, Department of, 98, 138, 146
Rhode Island Church Federation, The, 54
Richmond, Mary E., 286
Roberts, William H., 54 ff.
Rogers, Henry Wade, 141
Roman Catholic Church, The, x, 1, 7, 10, 21, 22, 25, 127, 193, 207, 209 ff., 291, 323
Roman Empire, The, 20
Roosevelt, Theodore, 47
Root, E. Talmadge, 54
Rural Problems, 306
Russell, Frank, 42 ff.
Russellites, The, 175
Russia, Relief to Churches of, 99, 208

Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, The, 14, 16, 23, 32, 151, 157, 159, 166, 201, 206, 279 ff., 321, 322, 325
Sanderson, Ross, 319
Sanford, Elias B., 45 ff., 54 ff.
Schaff, Philip, 36 ff.
Scherer, M. G. G., 190
Schleiermacher, Friedrich D. E., 28
Schmidt, Carl Ludwig, 16
Schmucker, Samuel S., 36 ff., 52 ff., 77, 189
Scotland, Union in, 32, 124
Seminaries and Training, Theological, xii, 45, 273 ff.
Service, Areas of, 126 ff.
Seesholz, Anne, 135
Seventh Day Adventists, The, 175
Seventh Day Baptists, The, 184
Shields, Richard E., 83
Sin, The Consciousness of, 265 ff.

Smith, Fred B., 79
Smith, Russell Gordon, 292
Soederblom, Nathan, 108, 116, 117
Social Gospel, The, 14 ff., 53, 60, 119, 123, 125, 138 ff., 282 ff., 294 ff.
Social Ideals of the Churches, The, 312 ff.
Social Service, Commission on, The, 97, 138 ff.
South India United Church, The, 201 ff.
Spain, Unity in, 121
Speer, Robert E., 61, 94
Spirit Holy, The, 21, 27, 29, 48, 151, 168, 227, 260, 322, 325
State and Local Federation, 5, 77 ff., 102, 147
State, Church and, 20, 72 ff., 215
Stelzle, Charles, 139, 289
Stewardship, 4, 145, 174, 247, 316 ff., 319
Stockholm Conference. *See* Universal Christian Council on Life and Work
Strong, Josiah, 41 ff.
Student Volunteer Movement, 51
Sunday Schools, The, 34
Sunday School Association, The International, 137
Sunday School Association, The World's, 4, 45
Sunday School Council of Evangelical Denominations, The, 137
Sunday School, International Lesson Committee, 35
Sunday School Society of Philadelphia, The, 34
Sunday School Union, The American, 34
Sweden, The Church of, 206
Swiss Church Federation, The, 107, 117

Talbot, Ethelbert, 47
Taylor, Graham, 45, 61, 286, 292
Theologians' Commission, The, 167
Theological Seminaries and Training, 273 ff.
Thompson, Charles L., 46
Tippy, Worth M., 139
Tokio, Foreign Mission Conference in, 50
Tract Society, The American, 35

Union, on Apostolic Principles, American Association for the Promotion of, 35
Union, The American and Foreign Christian, 5
Union, Organic, 87, 148 ff.
Unitarian Churches, The, 181, 182
United Brethren, The, 184
United Foreign Mission Society, The, 50 ff.
United Lutheran Church in America, The, 87
United Presbyterian Church, The, 183
Unity, Social and Political, 1 ff., 30, 126, 127, 324
Universal Christianity, 15
Universal Christian Council on Life and Work, x, 4, 53, 98, 116 ff., 124, 147, 170, 192, 195, 198, 207, 218, 228, 249, 255, 283
Universalist Churches, The, 181

Van Kirk, Walter W., 141
Vickrey, Charles V., 108, 208
Virgin Mary, The, 212 ff.
Voluntary Movements, Early, 33 ff.

Wallau, René, 122
Ward, William Hayes, 54
Warnshuis, A. L., 113
War-time Commission of the Churches, The General, 61 ff., 97
War-time Message of the Federal Council, 63 ff.
War Relief, 98
War and the Religious Outlook, The Committee on the, 66, 242
Week Day Religious Instruction, 96
Wenner, George U., 41, 96
Whitehead, Professor, 288
Whittier, John G., 326
Williams College, 50
Wilson, Woodrow, 55
Winchester, Benjamin S., 137
Wisconsin Church Federation, The, 54

Woman's Boards of Foreign Missions, Federation of, 4
Women, Council of, for Home Missions, 4, 128 ff., 195, 196
Women, National Conference of Protestant Church, 5
Wood, L. Foster, 140
Woolsey, Theodore D., 40
Woolsey, William E., 146
World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, 5, 106, 117, 119, 120, 142, 255
World Conference on Faith and Order, x, 4, 116, 150 ff., 218, 255
World Friendship Among Children, The Committee on, 98, 143
World Movements for Federal Unity, 105 ff.
World's Sunday School Association, The, 45, 105, 137, 255
Worship and Devotional Life, 98, 102, 157, 159, 163, 206, 225, 277 ff.

Yokohama, Foreign Mission Conference in, 50
York, The Archbishop of, 164
Young Men's Christian Association, The, 5, 6, 44, 49, 62 ff., 105, 120, 146, 222
Young Women's Christian Association, The, 5, 44, 49, 62 ff., 105, 120, 146, 222

Zahniser, Charles R., 274
Zelie, John S., 208
Zwingli, Huldreich, 23 ff., 123

Date Due

F 7 '39
F 20 '39
D 11 '42
D 22 '42
Ja 25 '43
My 27 '43
N 23 '43
FACULTY
Je 14 '45
FACULTY
F 20 '47
FACULTY
F 26 '48
Mr 5 '48
MR 19 '48
FACULTY
MY 3 '51
MY 17 '51
JE 7 - '51
FE 13 '53
JA 20 '55
FEB 25 '57
MAY 2 '57
[redacted]
[redacted]
DEC 1 '69
[redacted]
[redacted]
~~JUN 15 1972~~
~~Mending~~

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01027 1023